DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 178 95 EA 009 861

AUTHOR Bottomly, Forbes, Ed.
TITLE Critical Issues in American Education. A Report.
INSTITUTION Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 293p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$15.39 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; Curriculum; Educational Accountability; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; Educational Planning; *Educational Problems; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Governance; Social Problems; Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Institute for Chief State School Officers 1975

ABSTRACT

This report is based on a discussion of critical issues in education that was the focal point of the 1975 Institute of Chief State School Officers. In preparation for the 1975 Institute, each chief officer was asked to prepare a short paper describing the most important issues facing him on the state level and those he believed to be the most important national issues. Most of the report consists of those papers. In addition, there is also a lengthier "Overview of Critical Issues," which was written by Forbes Bottomly and Allison Kitfield based on the papers submitted, the discussions at the institutes and a summary of the institute's proceedings. The overview focuses in turn on the following : educational finance and governance; planning, evaluation, and accountability; professional development; school curriculum; and social issues in education. (JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144178

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CRITICAL ISSUES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

A REPORT TO TERREL H. BELL UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION BY CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

EA 009 861

CRITICAL ISSUES
IN
AMERICAN EDUCATION

A REPORT OF

CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

AT THE

1975

INSTITUTE FOR CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

SPONSORED BY THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION
IN COOPERATION WITH
THE COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

EDITED BY

FORBES BOTTOMLY, INSTITUTE DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was made possible under grants from the United States Office of Education. Special thanks are due to Dr. Jack P. Nix, Superintendent of Schools for the State of Georgia and President of the Council of Chief State School Officers and to Dr. Byron Hansford, Executive Secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers.

Significant in the development of this effort were Dr. Duane J. Mattheis, Executive Deputy Commissioner of the United States Office of Education; Dr. James E. Gibbs, Chief Multi-State Projects Branch; Dr. Thomas Carter, Director Educational Systems Development; and Charles L. Lovett III, Program Specialist.

The support of my institution, Georgia State University, and especially Dean of the School of Education Roy M. Hall made this effort possible.

Also thanks are due Elaine Evans, Cinda McNeil, and Allison Kitfield for typing, editing, and writing.

Forbes Bottomly

1975 Institute Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION--FORBES BOTTOMLY	1
AN OVERVIEW OF ISSUES--FORBES BOTTOMLY ALLISON KITFIELD	3
CRITICAL ISSUES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION-- CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS	25
ALABAMA--LEROY BROWN	25
ALASKA--MARSHALL L. LIND	32
AMERICAN SAMOA--MERE T. BETHAM	40
ARIZONA--CAROLYN WARNER	43
COLORADO--CALVIN M. FRAZIER	44
CANAL ZONE--DAVID SPEIR	53
CONNECTICUT--MARK R. SHEDD	59
DELAWARE--KENNETH C. MADDEN	68
FLORIDA--RALPH D. TURLINGTON	78
GEORGIA--JACK P. NIX	84
IDAHO--ROY TRUBY	88
ILLINOIS--JOSEPH M. CRONIN	92
INDIANA--HAROLD H. NEGLEY	99
IOWA--ROBERT D. BENTON	103
KENTUCKY--LYMAN V. GINGER	117

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

LOUISIANA--LOUIS J. MICHOT	129
MAINE--H. SAWIN MILLETT, JR.	135
MARYLAND--JAMES A. SENSENBAUGH	136
MASSACHUSETTS--GREGORY R. ANRIG	145
MICHIGAN--JOHN W. PORTER	147
MINNESOTA--HOWARD B. CASMEY	155
MISSISSIPPI--G. H. JOHNSTON	168
MISSOURI--ARTHUR L. MALLORY	172
NEBRASKA--ANNE CAMPBELL	179
NEVADA--KENNETH H. HANSEN	182
NEW HAMPSHIRE--NEWELL J. PAIRE	187
NORTH CAROLINA--A. CRAIG PHILLIPS	193
NORTH DAKOTA--M. F. PETERSON	206
OHIO--MARTIN W. ESSEX	219
OKLAHOMA--LESLIE FISHER	229
OREGON--VERNE A. DUNCAN	236
SOUTH CAROLINA--CYRIL B. BUSBEE	239
SOUTH DAKOTA--THOMAS C. TODD	246
UTAH--WALTER D. TALBOT	247
VERMONT--ROBERT A. WITHEY	249
VIRGIN ISLANDS--GWENDOLYN E. KEAN	253
VIRGINIA--W. E. CAMPBELL	254

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

WASHINGTON--FRANK B. BROUILLET	255
WEST VIRGINIA--DANIEL B. TAYLOR	258
WISCONSIN--BARBARA THOMPSON	259
WYOMING--ROBERT B. SHRADER	276
DR. BYRON HANSFORD	279
APPENDIX A	283

INTRODUCTION

The 1975 Institute of the Chief State School Officers was an opportune place and time for the discussion of critical issues in education. During recent years the problems of local districts arising out of desegregation, negotiations, financing, student rights, and other new or intensifying phenomena have caused increasing pressure on the State educational agencies. At the same time there has been a remarkable growth in the responsibility of the State agencies because of the enactment of federal laws with increased funding and complex regulations to carry out those laws. Then, too, the State legislatures have imposed broad new responsibilities on both the state and local agencies through their efforts to extend education to all children; to insure accountability; to give employees bargaining rights; to set certification standards; and even to mandate in matters of curriculum and instructional materials. When these pressures are examined in the context of a number of court decisions which have had powerful impact upon the state governance of education, one can readily understand the desire of the Chief State School Officers, upon whom these forces most strongly center, to study and discuss critical issues in American education and to make recommendations for needed policy or procedural changes.

Concurrently, United States Commissioner of Education Terrel H. Bell was seeking broader involvement in the development of federal educational policy by the educational community. It was through his efforts and those of CSSO President Jack Nix and Executive Secretary Byron Hansford that part of the

1975 Institute was given over to the discussion of critical issues.

To set the stage for such discussion each Chief was asked to put in writing a description of the most important issues facing him on the state level and those he believed to be the most important national issues. The resulting papers were distributed to the Chiefs at the opening of the Institute and formed the basis for ensuing discussions and the recommendations made at the Institute to the United States Commissioner of Education.

As the Institute began a committee of the Chiefs was appointed by Greg Anrig, Massachusetts Commissioner, who chaired the initial meeting. The committee was made up of Mark Shedd, Connecticut Commissioner of Education; Frank B. Brouillet, Superintendent of Public Instruction for Washington; Cyril B. Busbee, Superintendent of Education for South Carolina; and John W. Porter, Superintendent, Michigan State. Each committee member chaired a discussion session utilizing as a format a condensation of the Critical Issues made by John Porter.[1] For all the discussions the Chiefs met together in seminar-of-the-whole. The following overview of the Critical Issues has been derived from (a) the papers submitted, (b) the discussions at the Institute, and (c) the summary made at the Institute by John Porter.

---

[1] See Appendix A.

AN OVERVIEW
OF
THE CRITICAL ISSUES

The issues discussed by the Chiefs were by no means all-inclusive. In analyzing the following categorized imperative issues, the Chiefs recognized that there was a systematic interrelationship between these issues and the issues described in the various papers but not discussed because of time limitations.

I. FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

A. Finance.

It is not surprising that matters related to the financing of education ranked high on the list of issues facing the states and nation. The hydraheaded impact of inflation and recession along with general enrollment declines have been felt at the same time that many states have been struggling toward major reforms in both the raising of school revenues and their distribution. The Chiefs took note of the widely publicized crisis of New York City, the chronic deficit positions of a number of major districts and such recent catastrophic results of levy losses as that in Seattle where the School Board was forced to send termination notices to over 1500 employees. To a large degree these have grown out of continuing and unresolved conditions in our cities where problems of education, health, housing, employment, security, and isolation relate directly to the dignity, even the survival of minorities and the urban poor.

And they expressed grave concern that the accumulation of these crises, large and small, across the country are eroding public confidence and thus may slow the rate of economic recovery.

The Chiefs realized that while these crises were symptoms surfaced by recession and inflation, deeper causes were, perhaps, related to the need for a fundamental national reordering of priorities. As revenues become limited and finite, public services of all kinds are put on notice that they are in competition with one another for what is left. Recognizing that priorities ought to be aligned on the basis of rational, cooperative, and comprehensive planning among the various public agencies, the Chiefs nevertheless have felt the growing factionalization and politicization of various constituencies resulting in divisive lobbying and whipsaw collective bargaining. Public sector unions have increasingly banked their demands against the sanction of strikes, threatening local governance structures, pushing settlement requirements toward the State Education agency and pressing for financial solutions from state legislatures or beyond, from the federal level. The Chiefs discussed with concern the implications of proposed federal legislation which would place public employees under the NLRB or some similar Federal Board. Myron Lieberman was on hand to help with the analysis of this issue which has far-ranging and complex potentialities for the future of educational priorities and consequently for school financing.

As a reaction to all this, the Chiefs have noted a stiffening resistance on the part of the state legislators to bailing out local districts. They have seen an increased questioning of the quality or relevance of educational programs and a rising demand for an accountability which will somehow tie appropriations to results. They see a greater need on the part of educational leaders to demonstrate the relationship between quality and expenditure. And they agreed

with Mark Shedd who said that there is a relationship between expenditures and breadth of program; and the breadth of educational opportunities is an important measure of quality. The conclusions of the Philadelphia's Federal Reserve Bank economists that expenditures when allocated properly do make a difference in the achievement of students were discussed, and the Chiefs were urged to become acquainted with that study.

They are finding themselves caught up more and more in the search for competency and performance criteria to be used in certification. They have been faced with renewed pressures to economize, increase efficiency in the state and local educational enterprise and reduce administrative overheads.[2] They have sensed the warning signs which indicate that the escalation of education costs must be reduced if public support for education is to be maintained.[3] At the same time they see the growth of legislated programs for the handicapped, kindergarten, vocational training, bilingual education which raise expectations of parents but are insufficiently funded by the state. They observed a perpetual reluctance on the part of legislatures to reduce the number of uneconomical districts through consolidation.

Yet despite these forces the Chiefs have been steadfast in their search for ways of providing equal educational opportunities. They have come to see that the traditional line between the act of taxing for revenue and that of distributing for expenditure has become blurred. Lawsuits such as Serrano v. Priest and Rodriguez v. San Antonio Independent District have stimulated a number of remedial state court actions aimed at reducing the inequities in educational expenditures among school districts which result from disparities in those districts' property tax base. The actions continue despite the fact

---

[2] Anne Campbell, Nebraska State Commissioner of Education, p. 179.

[3] See Howard Casmey's computer proposal, p. 164.

that in Rodriguez the U.S. Supreme Court appears to have said that education is not a fundamental interest to which the Equal Protection Clause of the Federal Constitution would apply and thus require state support programs to be fiscally neutral. Wilson Riles predicted that as a result of California Supreme Court action and subsequent legislative action the state's system of school finance will have to be substantially revised.

The basic goal as stated by Mark Shedd should be that of equalizing educational opportunities by equalizing expenditures within and among states and equalizing the tax burden among taxpayers within and among states. As would be expected, the Chiefs raised a whole host of questions which attested to the complexities involved in achieving this goal. Fundamental questions related to the meaning of equality. The courts have long wrestled with the meaning, but the Chiefs examined it in a modern context. What is meant by equality in the tax burden? What is meant by equality in the way revenues are distributed? What is the relationship of equality to educational quality? Does the definition of equality differ from state to state, from locality to locality? Does financial equalization necessarily reduce the discretion of local districts? What are the ingredients of a financing system which will enhance the expansion of educational opportunity rather than stifle it?[4]

There were other questions related to the tax base, including what should be the balance among the various bases such as property, income, sales, business, and occupational? How should power equalizing be combined with state sources and state distribution methods? And Walter Talbot raised the question as to whether the intervention of the federal government produces an element of inequality. In a highly equalized state such as Utah, whenever the federal allocations are made as flat grants or without reference to the state's criteria of need, ability, and effort the result is often a disequalization. Therefore,

---

[4]See questions raised in Cyril Busbee's paper, p.243.

the search for equality should include the federal as well as the state and local sources.

Because of these complexities the Chiefs expressed strong support for federal funding of studies of state educational financial systems. Since each state has unique problems such studies should be carried on by state educational agencies with the aim of defining and achieving equity among school districts within states.

The Chiefs recommended that the U.S. Office of Education with what resources it has at hand including vigorous involvement of the regional offices, assist states with technical expertise in the search for information, studies, and, where possible, provide consultative help.

They also expressed to the Board of Directors of the Council of the Chief State School Officers the importance of sharing of information among the states, especially published materials related to this problem.

The Chiefs were reminded by Duane S. Mattheis, USOE Executive Deputy Commissioner, that the Education Commission of the States has a significant study underway in school finance which should be of considerable help to the Chiefs when it is completed.

After considerable discussion about the complex ramifications of placing public employees under the National Labor Relations Act, the Chiefs accepted a suggestion by Illinois State Superintendent Joseph M. Cronin that a meeting be held of five or ten Chiefs or their delegates to study the issue in more depth and hammer out recommendations for the November meeting. He offered to host a meeting in Chicago sometime in September or October.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS IN SCHOOL FINANCE

The following statements are not based upon a concensus of the Chiefs, but were expressed in discussions and in the papers as areas of major concern.

1. Federal funding mechanisms should not bypass the state educational agency. All Federal educational funds should flow through the state agency. If exceptions are inevitable the state agency should have the opportunity to examine and approve all grants.

2. Some Chiefs argue that there is now a need for a federal foundation program which will work toward equalization of financial resources among states. A few favor consolidation of programs to reduce overlap and bring into one package the programs which have proliferated not only by category, but by governmental department.[5] It would also help ease the problem caused by federal "seed" money which encourages programs to get underway but often cannot be continued at the local level. Other Chiefs question the wisdom of consolidation, especially as conceived by Title IV P.L. 93-380. The complexity of rules and regulations would wipe out the very goals of consolidation.

3. Federal regulations: (a) Problems occur both in the field and with Congress when the regulations are too exacting or exceed the extent of the law.

(b) While the Title I ESEA concept of comparability is a good one federal requirements often do not consider local needs. Each state should be allowed to submit comparability criteria as part of their annual program plan.

(c) The "Hold Harmless" concept should be re-evaluated.

(d) Early guidelines, with significant input from the Chiefs and local administrators, are much needed for new federal programs. It is recommended that the USOE develop a procedure for getting guidelines out in timely fashion and for involving the state and local amdinistrators in their drafting.

(e) Paper work: The reporting requirements of the federal government have reached the stage where there is a detrimental impact on the services

---

[5]See Marshall Lind's paper which describes how some Alaska children are enrolled in Title I, Title IV Bilingual, Title IV, Johnson-O'Malley, etc., causing teachers to complain; p.35 .

provided by state and local education agencies. It is recommended that the USOE Commissioner empanel a commission to review the extent of paperwork which goes into program plans, reports, studies, and develop a design for reducing the fragmentation, redundancy, and unnecessary data requirements of the process for all levels of government.

(f) Forward funding of Title I ESEA is seen as a necessary step for effective use of those funds. Late funding has resulted in poor planning and loss of trained talent.

(g) Administrative funds for federal projects should keep pace with inflation and expanded requirements.

(h) Special adaptation of federal funding programs for the U.S. territories would make the funding more useful to their unique situations.

(i) Title I Maintenance of Effort requirements while useful in discouraging the calculated substitution of federal for state funds should not be used to penalize children in districts where levy losses were beyond both the children's and the school administration's ability to remedy. The requirement should not be used to force change in a state's tax structure.

4. Because of its potential impact on finance and on governance the Chiefs expressed conviction that they should become directly involved in any federal collective bargaining legislative efforts.

B. Governance.

"Who should govern, manage, regulate, and operate American elementary, secondary, and vocational education?" This question, asked by Lyman Ginger, Kentucky State Superintendent of Public Instruction, pervaded the entire discussion of critical issues.

The Chiefs have watched the growth of the influence of the courts upon educational governance. Judicial decisions on equal opportunities, civil

rights, student rights, due process, open records, and other matters have had considerable effect upon the management of schools.

They have seen the impact of federal legislation and the power of federal rules and regulations upon the governance of state and local systems. They have resisted the tendency of federal efforts to bypass the state agency and have expressed concern over the disunity which often results from a proliferation of programs and regulations to administer them. And they have been perplexed by the paradoxical approach to aid to private schools and the dilution of the concept of separation of church and state by the federal regulations. The opinion has been expressed that the level of influence and control by the federal government is far out of proportion to the amount of funding which the federal government provides. Indeed, small government grants sometimes determine the priorities for the use of all other state and local funds.

They have witnessed the growth of organized school employee groups which have demanded and often won large concessions in the governance of local school districts.

They have observed the trend toward increased community involvement, with decentralization and community control as extreme manifestations. Less extreme but nevertheless significant has been the proliferation of state and local advisory committees required by federal legislation for the numerous federally funded programs.

They have seen the growth of educational enterprises in governmental departments and agencies outside the USOE and outside the state education agencies.

With local districts looking more and more to the state for resolution of problems, such as inflation, declining enrollments, bargaining, etc., and the federal government channeling more of its programs through the state agency, Chiefs have watched the role of the state board of education change.

And there are increasing questions as to the governance of professional certification, of vocational education, of education beyond the high school, such as regional technical schools and community colleges. The proliferation of private schools because of desegregation and veteran's benefits raises the question of who protects the public against educational quackery.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION

1. The USOE or NIE should establish a commission to sponsor studies which:

(a) Clarify the educational roles of the various levels of government--namely, local, intermediate, state, regional, and federal.

(b) Examine ways in which federal programs might enhance the capabilities of state and local governments to solve educational problems, to develop creative solutions at the local levels.

(c) Suggest methods for unifying efforts through consolidation or coordination of efforts to improve efficiency.

(d) Examine the proliferation of advisory councils with the aim of determining whether they are needed--indeed, if they have become politicized to a point that they are interfering with the efforts of the state and local governments to provide services in an effective way.

2. The USOE Regional officer should be given greater responsibilities in providing expertise and stimulating studies of governance.

3. The USOE should take the leadership within HEW and among other federal departments to coordinate educational programs such as early childhood, day care, etc., and manpower, vocational, etc., pieces of which are now the responsibility of various offices and agencies. In fact, as Calvin Frazier points out there is a need for the federal government to continue to set an example by bringing coordination to all human services and delivery systems.

4. The Chiefs should examine very carefully the efforts to move collective bargaining from the local and state levels to the federal level. The implications for such a move would have serious impact upon the governance of state and local education.

5. Within states there is a need to redefine the legal roles of state boards, intermediate boards, and local boards of education. The definitions should be in terms of pulling educational policymaking into more efficient and unified models. This would include the roles of vocational education and education beyond the high school as well as preschool educational efforts.

6. The USOE should establish a national educational policies commission, which commission would be free from federal control in promulgating educational policy direction.

7. The state education agencies should work to bring greater coordination and comprehensive planning among the various state agencies with the aim of improving the total living environment of children and adults.

8. The Council of Chief State School Officers should sponsor a proposal to establish a U.S. Department of Education with a cabinet rank Secretary.

II. PLANNING, EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY

In their papers the Chiefs almost universally, either directly or indirectly, emphasized the importance of planning. In Colorado Calvin M. Frazier has listed as high priority among ten critical issues that of improving short and long range planning. In fact, he sees planning as the vehicle for moving all the other nine priorities. Gregory R. Anrig views the inevitable shrinkage of resources and of the public educational establishment as a reason or, rather, a challenge for long-range planning strategies. To Mark Shedd, planning and evaluation are distinct but interdependent activities. "Planning feeds into evaluation and evaluation feeds into planning in a never-ending cycle. It is

imperative, therefore, that educators at all levels work together to determine their specific needs for planning and evaluation information; to decide how best to get this information to one another; and to apply (it) in ways which will keep the. . .process in smooth running order."[6]

The Chiefs have described this as being part of the system of accountability. They discussed the need for clarification of goals, refinement of objectives and for obtaining more general agreement about the mission of the schools. They explored the topic of community and staff involvement in the planning process as a way to obtain that agreement.

The need for the development of management information systems which would gather, store, consolidate, and provide relevant, usable, accurate information for planning purposes was recognized as a critical one. The streamlining of data collection and reporting systems was emphasized. For as Robert G. Shrader, Wyoming State Superintendent, wrote, "The collection of data is necessary to identify priorities, to contribute to the solution of major issues, to plan and manage programs, to allocate resources, to assess program effectiveness, to enact legislation, to audit expenditures and to exercise stewardship over public funds."[7] In this respect Byron Hansford suggested that federal data collection efforts should be coordinated with state and local efforts so as to help reduce the data redundancy and eliminate unnecessary paperwork.[8]

Barbara Thompson, Wisconsin State Superintendent, wrote that there will be a major emphasis in the future upon program evaluation and that the state agencies will coordinate their management strategies more closely with the local education

---

[6] See Critical Issues in American Education, p. 62.

[7] Ibid., p. 278.

[8] Ibid., p. 281.

agencies to complete the accountability chain.[9] Delaware Superintendent Kenneth C. Madden states that the refinement of monitoring, evaluation, and dissemination should be a goal of state education agencies.[10] And Jack Nix sees the need for specific criteria for evaluating student achievement. He believes that criterion-referenced tests provide promise for evaluating the educational systems in terms of their goals.[11]

Both in their discussions at the Institute and in their papers the Chiefs expressed the imperative need for reliable evaluation of the effects of school experiences on students, parents, and the professional school staffs. Because of the publicity given to recent studies which contradict one another, and because of the lack of a stable, reliable base upon which the schools can rely for feedback corrective information, a great deal of confusion exists in both the public and professional ranks.

Changing conditions require better planning techniques. For instance, the problems of developing career and occupational educational programs relate to information about jobs. The Chiefs pointed up the desirability of having an updated manpower needs assessment system at work nationally and locally for that purpose.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PLANNING, EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY

1. The USOE and the NIE should harmonize their efforts in helping state and local systems grow in their ability to carry out action research, to disseminate and use the results.

2. The USOE should provide incentive funds to states to enhance their

---

[9]See Critical Issues in American Education, p 261.

[10]Ibid., p.74.

[11]Ibid., p.86.

internal management abilities and to help through regional offices with cooperative interchanges or partnerships between states.

3. The Council of Chief State School Officers and the Education Commission of the States should place at a high level of priority the activity of the CSSO Committee on Evaluation and Information Systems to the end of meeting the information demands of the federal government and getting a handle on some of the basic questions of cost and effectiveness of educational programs and services.

4. Educational planning should be a part of comprehensive planning and incentives for such planning should be provided at national and state levels. The "linkage" incentives of the federal programs ought to be expanded and strengthened.

III. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Recognizing that the quality of education depends upon the competency of the people involved, the Chiefs have placed staff development high on their list of critical issues. They foresee a period of very little turnover because of the recession. They also have predicted that with the enrollment declines plus the advent of increased numbers of negotiated seniority contracts there will be a preponderance of mid-career professionals in the teaching and administrative ranks during the next decade or so. As they see the complexities of the problems facing education the Chiefs have set as a major priority that of helping such individuals prepare to deal with these problems.

In addition, the growing demands for accountability have led to the search for competency and performance-based certification and staff development efforts.

Increased requirements for bilingual, bicultural, special education, career education, and other exigent and emerging needs also place unusual demands upon staff development.

The Chiefs strongly stated the need for long-range planning in the whole field of teacher training, both inservice and pre-service. Many of them indicated that the programs were moving from the college campus to the scene of action--that is, the schools and classrooms. But there was a conviction stated a closer relationship should be developed with the state education agencies, the schools, and the universities.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Chiefs felt that the need for staff development was critical. It is a matter of such national importance that federal intervention should continue. EPDA was helpful, the idea of teacher centers is good, and the Title IV and I bits have had their effect. But there is a need as Kenneth Madden, Delaware State Superintendent, stated for a massive federal effort in educational staff development. Principals and other administrators should be included since nothing happens unless there is total organization improvement, and their leadership is of primary importance.

IV. SCHOOL CURRICULUM - RESPONSIVENESS

The chief concerns in this area relate to the educational system's ability to provide basic or "survival" skills. The economic bind in which most districts find themselves, the expanded national, state, and local commitment to equal educational opportunity and increasing public disillusionment with the perceived failure of the schools to provide a minimum of the basic skills are all forcing a reassessment and reaffirmation of the fundamental goals of the system. Part of the public perception of failure may result from a lack of first-hand exposure and media misrepresentation, and perhaps an adult preference for a more traditional style and content, an education not unlike that which adults themselves had.

In their discussions the Chiefs recognized that discipline was of paramount

concern to parents, as successive polls have indicated. They took account of the criticisms directed at the schools for permissiveness and other contributions to the alleged lack of discipline. In their analysis the Chiefs viewed the situation as very complex. They understand that many parents are frustrated in their attempts to relate to their own children, who gain much of their value and behavioral inspiration from peer or general societal groups, rather than from parents. They have seen the close reflection in school attitudes of manifestations in the general society. For instance, when one sees the extent to which violence is glorified in press, television, theater, and literature, when one observes a half million people rioting in the streets of Philadelphia because the local sluggers win the Stanley Cup, and when Congress fails to take national action in gun control it becomes apparent that the schools are asked to provide and enforce one standard for youth while there is yet another for adults. The Chiefs viewed the causes of delinquency as deeply rooted in our social system and recognized that basic remedies would have to come through total environmental improvement.

Nonetheless, they were realistic in examining the responsibilities of the schools in dealing with these problems. Factors cited such as significant dropout rates, the relationship of reading failure to delinquent behavior and declining scores on achievement tests all raise a number of questions, among them: How can the schools improve upon their ability to effect a more individualized instruction? How can they better engage children by weaving the educational process more tightly into the real-world experiences and perceptions of the children? And how can educational services be best integrated with other support services, such as health, guidance, nutrition, transportation, and in some cases even housing to assist the multi-problem child?

Another focus of the basic skills was the area of special education, for

the handicapped, those children with behavioral problems, and the exceptional ones. The three main problems in this area are the expanded responsibilities without commensurately increased appropriations, the insufficient number of teachers trained to deal with special education problems, and the dilemma of balancing individual needs with mainstreaming.

Occupational competency has in recent times become regarded as part of the fundamental education provisions. This shift in the school mandate necessitates a number of revisions in the concept of career education. The most significant of these is the new emphasis on career education for every child, integrated into the general curriculum. Other concerns expressed by the Chiefs were that career education be tailored to fit the needs and talents of the individual as well as the society, and that it stress alternatives for every child; that career education be deschooled and deprofessionalized as is practical and that curriculum planning be flexible and continuously updated based on the most current information and most reasonable projections available to ensure the best possible fit between entry skills and the job market.

John Porter suggested that even under these best of circumstances, the schools will be a bitter disappointment because the guarantee of any job, much less a potentially fulfilling one, is out of the range of their control. There are simply not enough jobs and an even bleaker projection unless there is a reordering of national priorities and policy. Among solutions offered by the Chiefs to this very pressing problem were a youth corp not unlike those of the 1930's to provide job experience; Federal support of staff and program development and "model" experimental projects; a new counseling/guidance system involving employment services, labor and employers; increased coordination on the national and state level with other departments and agencies, and the need for the private sector to become more involved, including assuming some responsibility for providing job experience.

The expansion of the concept of survival skills above mentioned to include life or "quality of life" skills was a repeated concern of the Chiefs. Among those things mentioned as necessary in preparation for an adult role were: citizenship skills--moral and ethical values articulated as an understanding of and respect for freedom, the democratic system, and the law; student rights, including participation in the determination of his or her education; and "coping skills", including an exposure to and understanding of the various adult roles of husband or wife, parent, and consumer, and adult concerns such as physical and mental health, use of leisure time, aging, and continued growth.

The issue of educating a diverse student body for a pluralistic future has already been mentioned. Schools are faced not only with providing individualized instruction to meet the very different styles and capabilities of each child, involving the provision of alternative styles or education as well, but they are faced with integrating disparate multi-cultural and multi-lingual groups within the same framework. Concerns of the Chiefs in this regard included the necessity for a shift in the current teacher supply to meet the special multi-cultural, multi-lingual needs and the development of human relations skill as an integral component of the school program.

Concurrent with a renewed emphasis on a "basic" and perhaps somewhat traditional education, and a logical extension of the "lifeskills" approach is the shaping of new educational dimensions based on various changes either beginning or accelerating in the society. Curriculum planning, reflective of the accelerating of education and the rapid outdating of knowledge, is shifting in emphasis from content to process, with an emphasis on sharpening skills of selection, synthesis, and evaluation. The focus of the educational effort is becoming change--that is, how to teach an understanding of it and an ability to cope with it. Further, the overview of education as a limited stage or stages,

time-tied to children and adolescents with periodic sabbaticals for career retraining, is shifting to a concept of life-long learning.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING SCHOOL CURRICULUM - RESPONSIVENESS

1. A national policy of education should be enunciated which includes as a major theme a renewed effort in providing all children with basic "survival" skills. Included in this is an effort to define basic skills, to find appropriate ways of teaching them and to devise valid measures of progress.

2. In their search for better ways of dealing with discipline and behavior problems Chiefs should consider:

(a) Working with other agencies and groups on the problems and supporting efforts to improve the living environments of children.

(b) Providing a range of alternatives in education to make learning experiences more real to learners with varying learning styles and backgrounds. This is especially important on the secondary school level with attention directed to such studies as that of ASCD and the California RISE report.

3. Career education should be integrated into the total curriculum with the deschooling of some aspects of career education to include the involvement of the working and business communities. Programs should be constantly updated based upon valid, up-to-date job information.

(a) There should be a national youth corps program patterned upon the C.C.C., Job Corps, and others to provide work experience and public service opportunities for young men and women.

(b) Counselling services should be expanded to include employment services, employers, labor, and government.

4. There should be Federal incentives to retrain teachers in order to shift them from over-supply areas to under-supply areas. The latter are now

in special education, multi-cultrual, bi-lingual, and the human relations fields. But the effort should be to make the profession one of life-long learning in order to deal with changing requirements of the schools.

5. The momentum in early childhood education should be continued as both a national policy and as state and local efforts.

V. SOCIAL ISSUES

The Chiefs view the relationship of school to society as a dynamic one, one seemingly out of balance at present and undergoing tremendous stresses. The educational system is seen as a function of the society not only in its potential but in its limitations. And the educational system today is and will continue to be faced with problems largely outside its possible range of influence. Three major interrelated areas of social concern are finance, control, and the role of the schools as agents for social change.

The financial double bind of expanded responsibilities in a time of declining enrollments/declining revenues and skyrocketing costs has been previously described. The public demand being pressed upon the system at all levels is for accountability. Several of the Chiefs cited the need for schools to respond with a demonstration of more effective, efficient fiscal management and of a tighter relationship between present and increased levels of funding and the quality of educational offerings. As noted by Craig Phillips, North Carolina State Superintendent, the current fiscal crisis may be, in fact, a "dangerous opportunity"; among the positive aspects suggested by some of the Chiefs were the hope that declining enrollments may stimulate creative alternatives such as an expanding of the traditional uses of facilities and personnel to include more "lifelong" educational opportunities and early childhood education and that limited resources may result in innovative utilization of personnel, experience, and space outside the school to expand the breadth and

increase the relevancy of the education offering.

School personnel trained and experienced in the problems associated with growth are having to shift gears to deal with the double problem of inflation and shrinking enrollments. That process may afford an excellent framework in which to teach students both about the environmental issues of limiting growth, pollution and conservation, and about the resultant impact of those forces on the economy, thereby helping students achieve a more realistic appraisal of their economic potential and the future.

The components of the very volatile issue of control have been elaborated under the heading of "Governance". Chiefs number among the constraints significantly affecting the functioning of the educational system the proliferation and inflexibility of Federal regulations, advisory councils, public sector bargaining, and efforts at parent control. Many of them expressed concern about the public perception of the schools as being out of control as far as the students are concerned, as places of violence and vandalism, where drug abuse is prevalent and discipline problems preclude proper teaching. Violence in the schools and student discipline are very real issues; to the extent that they reflect the world outside the school a double standard exists between acceptable adult behavior and that acceptable for students, and the educator's response is limited to such indirect after-the-fact efforts as seeking involvement in the development of television material and the shaping of other media. Early childhood intervention was cited by many Chiefs as a very critical handle the schools must grasp to head off the problems. Increased efforts at identifying and reaching potential dropouts was another. There are a number of studies, one if not more federally sponsored, of the dropout problem, and a critical need for the many creative programs existing to be evaluated and information about them made available to other communities.

To the extent that parents (or more intensively, non-parents) perception

of the discipline problem reflects a preference for a more authoritarian, "traditionalist" education, there exists a dilemma. It is tremendously ironic that the adults who feel most out of control in their own lives frequently seek out a kind of education and training which encourages passivity and, full circle, which ill prepares the student ever to shape his or her own environment as a dynamic force instead of becoming an impotent victim.

But perhaps the single most pressing social issue is the manner and extent to which the schools are viewed as tools to effect social change. Although law, desegregation continues to be challenged both conceptually and in practice and in many areas a significant resegregation trend is emerging. The recession has erased many minority gains in employment, limited opportunities for recent graduates, reduced the motivation for many coming up through the educational system, and intensified the survival struggle required of the poor and the disadvantaged in this country. And schools have been given a disproportionate responsibility for remedying these crises.

That responsibility seems to be threefold: (1) to prepare the student, specifically, to enter the job market, and generally, to make the functional transition to a productive adult role; (2) to provide equal educational opportunity thereby countering the handicapping forces of poverty and generations of inadequate education; and (3) to reduce isolation among children to effect a more tolerant and harmonious society.

There is a desperate need for constructive dialogue on this subject, and for a concerted effort to provide a clearer public vision of the limited capability of the school in meeting these responsibilities. The interrelationships of schools to other societal systems must be studied and defined, and the questions at hand approached with a concentrated cooperative effort. On the Federal level the USOE must effect more coordination between its activities and

those of the Office of Civil Rights, the Civil Rights Commission, the Civil Rights Office under the Department of Justice, and other pertinent departments and agencies. The Chiefs described a strong need for NIE leadership in identifying those factors and programs which effect increased equality of educational opportunity. The definition of equal opportunity must be expanded to encompass the reduction of all kinds of isolation, including socio-economic, age and suburban/urban, as well as racial segregation because "failure to learn to live devoid of fear in multi-ethnic situations today will have grave implications for the future. . .(and) poor human relations robs even the best achiever from realizing his full potential."[12]

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING SOCIETAL ISSUES

1. There should be constructive dialogue within our society regarding the role and responsibilities of the public schools.

2. School efforts cannot be separated from the actions of the rest of society since social issues immediately impinge upon the schools, therefore educational planning should be part of comprehensive planning for the improvement of the total living environment of all people. This requires that the federal and state governments coordinate their efforts in providing planning and incentives for such improvement.

The Chiefs examined the issues with insight and candor. Despite the fact that many of the problems seemed of incredible complexity and beyond the ability of the Chiefs or the schools to resolve, there was expressed a realistic confidence that the resources were available if only they could be mobilized and brought to bear. As Robert Benton said, "To the optimist, a problem really becomes a challenge." The mood of the Chiefs indicated a desire to accept the challenge and get on with the job.

---

[12] See Critical Issues in American Education, p. 143.

CRITICAL ISSUES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

BY

CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

FOR

1975 CSSO INSTITUTE

ALABAMA

LeRoy Brown
State Superintendent of Education

Problems and issues related to federal educational programs in Alabama are presented in this paper. No attempt was made to identify and discuss all of the problems or issues. Only such detail as was felt necessary to identify the problem and to stimulate discussion is presented.

Church-State Relationship in Federally Funded Educational Programs

Public agencies which administer federally funded educational programs are faced with the difficult task of providing benefits and services to children enrolled in non-public schools. Problems related to this task include:

1. Benefits and services must be provided in such a manner as not to benefit the non-public school. It is difficult to see how any service provided would not benefit the school. For example, a project which provides library resources for non-public school children may result in the non-public school lowering expenditures in this area.
2. Section 134.101 of the Proposed Rules for ESEA, Title IV provide that "any project to be carried out in public facilities which

involves joint participation by children enrolled in private schools and children enrolled in public schools shall include such provisions as are necessary to avoid the separation of participating children by school enrollment or religious affiliation." Evidently, no flexibility is allowed. This could produce an administrative problem.

3. Title IV of ESEA appears to "blackmail" the local educational agency into providing services to non-public school children. The local educational agency must "consult with 'appropriate private school officials' with respect to all matters" concerning Title IV programs. However, should any problem arise whereby the local educational agency cannot provide the services, then the local educational agency is subject to losing its Title IV funds. The local educational agency is prohibited from dividing the funds on a per pupil basis and allowing the private school to provide the services.
4. A local educational agency must work with the officials from each of the non-public schools. For example, a local educational agency with ten non-public schools in its school district must work with officials from all ten schools. It should be noted that the local educational agency does not receive any administrative funds under Part B of ESEA, Title IV.

We recommend that the Office of Education initiate a study which would explore the problems related to providing services to non-public school children. Such a study should attempt to identify alternative methods for providing such services.

Relationship of OE - SEA - LEA in Federally Funded Programs

The Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution maintains that "powers not delegated to the Federal Government and not prohibited to the States are reserved to the States or to the people." Since the Constitution does not mention education, one would assume that the responsibility for education is reserved for the State or for the people. Accordingly, each State has recognized its responsibility in regard to education and has enacted State laws to provide for education based on State and local priorities. Additionally, the U.S. Congress has enacted laws providing financial aid designed to meet specific national concerns and priorities. In achieving the purposes outlined by Congress, funds are made available in one of the three following means:

1. From a Federal agency to the State educational agencies (Example: Title V of ESEA), or
2. From a Federal agency through the State educational agencies to the local educational agencies (Example: Title I of ESEA), or
3. From a Federal agency directly to the local educational agencies (Example: Indian Education Act).

It would appear that the first two methods are appropriate and in keeping with provisions of the Constitution while the third method apparently ignores the State as the agency responsible for education. No problem is presented with the direct OE to LEA grant. The problem arises in by-passing the SEA in the application process. Funding mechanisms or procedures designed to exclude State educational agencies certainly appear to deviate from the intent of the Constitution.

Compounding the problem further are programs such as Part A of the National Reading Improvement Program which provide funds to both State and local educational agencies on a competitive basis.

Ideally, the problem would be solved by:

1. Eliminating provisions in laws which create LEA and SEA competition for funds.
2. Maintain provisions in existing laws which provide for funds to be provided to LEA's through SEA's.
3. Require through the various laws and applicable Rules and Regulations that all agencies, institutions, organizations, and/or individuals submitting applications to the U.S. Office of Education for funding under any discretionary program must submit the application to the SEA in that particular State for review and comment prior to submission to USOE.

The USOE should work with the Congress to bring about appropriate changes in the laws.

Formula for Distribution of Federal Funds

Currently, the National Institute of Education is initiating a study to explore alternative methods for distributing ESEA, Title I funds. This study is greatly needed and hopefully will result in a formula which is fair and equitable for all concerned.

Since the enactment of the Education Amendments of 1974 (P. L. 93-380), a problem has been discovered in the formula for the distribution of funds for ESEA, Title IV, particularly, for Part C of Title IV. It has been pointed out that the current Title IV formula creates a hardship for some of the less populous States.

Additionally, the criteria presented in P. L. 93-380 which are required to be utilized by the SEA in developing a formula for the distribution of Title IV, Part B funds present a problem in Alabama. The Law requires that substantial funds be provided to LEA's whose tax effort for education is

substantially higher than the average for the State but whose per pupil expenditure is no higher than the State average. This means that the tax effort for education for each LEA must be examined in relationship to the average for all LEA's in the State. This would not present a problem if all taxes for education in each LEA were based on the same source, i.e., ad valorum tax. However, in Alabama, each LEA has flexibility in determining its source of educational revenue. For example, one LEA may have a ten mill ad valorum tax and a one cent per can beer tax while another LEA may have a twelve mill ad valorum tax, a two cents per package cigarette tax, and a one percent sales tax. It would be difficult to determine, with any significant degree of accuracy, which LEA has the greatest tax effort for education.

We recommend that a study be made to determine an equitable means for distributing all federal funds. Such a study should include an examination of:

1. Method(s) for determing students to be counted in a formula including a means for updating the count.
2. Method(s) for determing the amount of funds per child. (Example: Should it be the same per child in each State or should it be based on some cost of living factor or on an equalization factor?)
3. Method(s) for determing administrative funds for each program in each State.
4. Alternative method(s) for rewarding LEA initiative on tax effort.

Comparability

The ESEA, Title I requirement that all local educational agencies exhibit and maintain comparability between Title I and non-Title I schools is an important one. Not only has it pointed out inequities between Title I and non-Title I schools, but it has also pointed out differences within both

categories of schools. No one can disallow the fact that state and local services should be provided equitably to all children. We have no objection nor have we heard any objection to the concept of comparability.

However, certain problems exist in the method currently being utilized by the Office of Education in determining comparability within the LEA's. These problems include:

1. Data must be collected on a date selected (arbitrarily) by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Each State should be allowed to determine the date when data will be collected. This way, the selected data could coincide with existing data-collecting activities. In Alabama this could be the date set to collect data for the first or second monthly reporting period. This not only would assist in LEA's exhibiting comparability, but would be extremely beneficial to the State in checking comparability reports and monitoring the maintenance of comparability.
2. When schools within a LEA are not comparable by pupil-teacher ratio or the annual average per pupil expenditure, they must report the amount expended and to be expended in total and per child for textbooks, library resources and other instructional materials and supplies. The latter requirement is punitive and should be deleted if the LEA will ultimately be required to satisfy the former two criteria.
3. In many cases the grouping of schools provided in the Rules and Regulations does not meet LEA needs.
4. Current Rules and Regulations provide no flexibility where conditions would warrant such. Experimental programs must be included the same as a regular school program. School principals who provide leadership and encouragement which results in teachers pursuing and

attaining higher degrees may cause serious comparability problems for the school system; thus, individual school initiative is stifled.

To overcome the problems presented by comparability, the U.S. Office of Education should allow States to submit a comparability Plan which would outline how the State educational agency was going to determine and monitor LEA comparability. This Plan could be part of the currently required Annual Program Plan.

In addition, I should like to mention several issues which I think are of importance as we work together in the field of education, and I shall list them as follows:

1. Relationships and role of the professional versus the lay leadership.
2. Finance -- adequacy, sources, equity of distribution and lead time needed for planning.
3. The need for articulation and understanding by the profession in the various segments of education; such as higher education, vocational education, elementary, secondary, preschool and adult. There should be no empire building, but there should be a motivation to serve at all levels without unwholesome competition.
4. Advisory committees and their place in the scheme of things in education.
5. Moral and ethical values that should be practiced with the elimination of greed and power struggles motivated by selfish desires versus motivation for the good of society.
6. The free enterprise system.
7. Employment and training consistent with needs of the individual and society.

8. Respect for law and country.
9. The meaning of freedom and loyalty to convictions and principles.
10. Health
11. Energy -- environment
12. International goodwill -- family, the neighborhood, national and international.
13. A look to the future with hope and not despair.
14. Character building
15. Teacher competency and quality schools for all.
16. The federal share of financing education should be approximately one-third of the total because this is in the national interest.

ALASKA

Marshall L. Lind
State Commissioner of Education

Critical educational concerns in Alaska at this point in time revolve around two central issues; first, the need to develop and sustain a unified system of education for all Alaskan students and second, to assure that this system, both in the whole and in its parts, meets the identified needs of the individual student. In addressing these central issues, Alaska is both helped and hindered by one of its major partners in the educational enterprise--the federal government.

Although Alaska has in the past and continues to receive benefits through federally funded programs, this position paper will deal with some of the major problems in the federal-state relationship which keep Alaska from maximizing its use of federal education monies.

In analyzing the present status of federal/state education

relationships, I am indebted to a work sponsored and produced by the Council of Chief State School Officers, entitled State and Federal Relationships in Education. Although this work is rather dated, as it was published several years ago, in 1971, many of the concerns raised then continue to adversely affect our relationship today.

The document begins with a detailed consideration of the roles of the several levels of government concerned with education--local, state and federal. In defining the federal role, the CCSSO study committee states: "The federal government has a significant role in education based on its concern for the national welfare... The federal government should assist the states financially in these endeavors but should not seek to require uniformity among the states, through regulation or other techniques affecting eligibility of state or local education agencies to receive federal funds." (emphasis added)

This concern regarding forced heterogeneity among the several states is a predominant one in Alaska, where geographic, climatic and demographic conditions spawn a range of unique problems and needs. In short, in our state, as quite possibly in others, the goals of the state educational system differ--at times radically--from the goals of the larger, national education scene. In those cases where goals are congruent, methods of attaining these goals will vary considerably from place to place.

The document cited above defines the state role in education as threefold: first, to establish acceptable levels of quality programs of instruction within its boundaries; second, to provide leadership in establishing and maintaining instructional programs of increasing quality; and third, to allocate both state and federal funds to local districts for the purposes of strengthening local programs.

In Alaska, we have a system of state funding which guarantees almost

full state support for basic education. The state share of basic education costs is now at least 93% of the total. In some districts, the state share approaches 100%. In addition, our state support for both special and vocational education is nearly 100% of program costs, except in the very large (by Alaska standards) districts. The state also recognizes its responsibility in the areas of bilingual education, community education, adult education, and career education and these areas are generating increasing state support.

Yet, in spite of this major state committment, we are still, in several of these areas, bound by federal rules and regulations which are not in the best interests of the total statewide program. A good example is Vocational Education where the comparatively small federal contribution to the total program wields unbalanced power and in reality, determines priorities for the use of all funds allocated to vocational education in Alaska.

The CCSSO study document points out another area in which federal intervention works against state functions. "The administration of the State education system by State agencies must be unified, not fragmented by federal programs; flexible, not burdened with arbitrary constraints imposed by federal programs; and aggressive, not bogged down by unrealistic 'Administrivia' required by federal regulation and guidelines."

In Alaska, as elsewhere, the categorical nature of federal funding encourages fragmentation of effort, both at the state and local levels. Unrealistic constraints on the cooperative use of federal funding establishes an organization, on the state level, which gives automatic and in some way, reprehensible, importance to those areas generating the most federal funds. Thus, priorities are artificially tied to levels of federal funding rather than to identified needs at the state and local level. Again, federal fear of comingling of funds--admittedly justified in some cases from an accounting

standpoint--works against cooperative, comprehensive planning addressed to generic needs. For example, in Alaska special education funds accrue from several federal sources: ESEA Title VI, P. L. 89-313, Vocational Education handicapped funds and now, P. L. 874. Regulations for each program differ; funds must be expended and accounted for separately, definitions of eligible recipients are not consistent. Yet, in reality, we are speaking generally of the same child in each of these programs. State level confusion multiplies at the local level. In some of our rural, "bush" schools, the same child is enrolled in an ESEA Title I program, and ESEA Title VI bilingual program, an ESEA Title VI program, a Johnson O'Malley enrichment program, etc. Teachers complain, seriously, that by the time the child has been removed from the regular classroom for each of these activities, less than 30 minutes of the school day remains to bring some cohesion into his educational program. Coordinated planning on the local level receives little support from the federal regulations mandating separating consumer advisory councils or groups for each program. Parochialism abounds. Each advisory group strives for status. Each established its own priorities and activities. Each views the recipient child as its special prerogative. Each receives at least implicit support from the federal government for such feelings.

In 1971, CCSSO recommended that "The proliferation of advisory councils at the state level should be halted and those now required should be reviewed for possible consolidation or elimination." Since that time, the numbers of federally-mandated advisory groups have continued to grow at the state level and have infiltrated the local levels as well. The problem, identified four years ago, worsens.

The state and local fragmentation mirrors the confusion at the national level, where diverse federal agencies sponsor and administer educational programs. The CCSSO document recommends that the U.S. Office of Education

assume national responsibility for all federal education-related programs, and established several acceptable functions for the Office of Education which are still valid, although not always visible, today. "The Office of Education should fulfill the following administrative functions (for all federally funded educational programs):

1. Interpret federal laws and write regulations necessary for implementation.
2. Provide leadership for gathering, processing and interpreting data to assess national education needs, formulate broad goals and establish national priorities.
3. Prepare guidelines for the preparation of state plans and project proposals.
4. Distribute funds to states according to legal requirements.

CCSSO also recommended that "the Need for and operational objectives of regional offices should be carefully reexamined." In the four years since that recommendation was made, Alaska has seen a steady growth in the usefulness of its regional office. A recent USOE document, A General Description of the Mission of the Regional Office, outlines two broad categories of service which the Alaska Department of Education endorses as appropriate to its regional office: 1) information and advice with respect to statutory, policy and administrative requirements for Federal financial assistance or benefits, intended to facilitate the efficient transfer of federal resources; and 2) development and management assistance to education service providers intended to enhance the leadership roles throughout the educational community, consistent with State and local responsibilities for education."

In this context, Alaska finds its regional office serviceable and

commends Region X, USOE, for its attempts to provide comprehensive assistance, particularly in the area of rural education.

Another aspect of some federally funded programs which must be mentioned as dehabilitating to the State Education Agency is that of federal bypass of state agencies to deal directly with LEA's. Perhaps no other action by the federal government so undermines a state in its constitutional role as educational leader than that of dealing directly with local agencies in the operation of educational programs. Here, I again echo the recommendation of the CCSSO study: "Federal funds of all types should be allocated through state education agencies."

The above discussion has dealt at some length with federal barriers to the provision, in Alaska, of a unified system of education for all Alaskan students. Much of the difficulty could be resolved were the federal government to actively pursue a policy outlined by CCSSO: "The bulk of federal government funds should be in the form of general or block aid grants. Categorical aids should, with the exception of critical national emergency needs, be limited to excess of cost programs that deal with national goals." Turning now to Alaska's second primary education issue, that of assuring that educational programs are designed and implemented to meet individual needs, I suggest several ways in which the federal government could be an active, beneficial partner. Again, many of the recommendations I have are similar to those raised several years ago, but which have not been followed through.

Right now, Alaska is at a turning point in education. It has, as mentioned above, vigorously assumed its fiscal responsibility for both basic education and for special education programs. With over 40% of the state's annual budget directed to operation of education programs, the state has few

resources left to expend on the research and development functions necessary for educational renewal and change.

The CCSSO report stated the SEA need in this area succinctly: "State Education Departments require research personnel expert in sensing problems, in supporting researchers in many institutions in working on such problems and in disseminating to the field useful information growing out of such activity." In this area, the federal government could provide valuable assistance, first by making available those funds needed for state level R&D and second, by disseminating, in a usable form the results of those R&D activities carried on elsewhere.

As a possible course of action in this area, CCSSO recommended:

"A joint Office of Education/State Department of Education committee on research and development should be formed to give continuing attention to the following:

1. Identifying educational problems requiring research and development;
2. Recommending priority areas for research, development and dissemination programs;
3. Providing a coordinating machinery whereby states may work together with other institutions on common problems; and
4. Providing training for state education agency and local education agency personnel and users of research and development."

Although various federal programs and agencies have, in recent years, begun to address this problem from the state viewpoint, at least, the federal approach is again characterized by fragmentation and lack of coordination. Nor has the federal government moved to provide R&D funds, in any significant amount, to those agencies most responsible for the

identification and alleviation of educational needs--the state education agencies.

Without such support, Alaska's efforts to move toward an educational system responsive to individual needs will be sporadic.

I would like to summarize briefly the most important concerns Alaska has concerning federal education programs.

First, is the lack of congruence between federal education goals and methods and Alaskan educational goals and needs. Second, federal rules and regulations, even those in the areas addressing common state/federal goals, exert undue and inappropriate influence over state administration and local program operation. Third, regulations for various federal programs prohibit, albeit inadvertently in some cases, coordinated, comprehensive planning. Fourth, the proliferation of unrelated and often competitive advisory groups for various federal programs interjects parochialism and fragmentation which limits program effectiveness. Fifth, the federal practice of bypassing SEA's to deal, in some programs, directly with LEA's undermines the State's mandated, constitutional responsibility for educational leadership. Sixth, federal support of research and development is spotty, uncoordinated and, in many cases, unrelated to the needs of the front line educational agencies. In partial resolution of these concerns, Alaska recommends that federal intervention in education, except in cases of dire, documented national emergency, take the form of block grant support to SEA's the use of which is at the discretion of SEA's in meeting identified local needs. Further, Alaska recommends that educational efforts at the federal level be coordinated to avoid present fragmentation both at the national and state levels. Finally, Alaska recommends increased federal support to states for research and development activities directed at changing and improving the existing state educational systems.

AMERICAN SAMOA

Mere T. Betham
Director of Education

1. Accountability and Assessment

While many state legislatures have passed "accountability" statutes, the term itself may appear alien not only to our own educational system but to the territory as well. Nevertheless, the critical need in the area of accountability is quite obvious.

The Michigan model is one that relates more perhaps for steps that must be taken toward providing an effective evaluating and assessing tool to measure the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of our total instructional program. Reliable measuring instruments must be researched. The capacity to evaluate the value of one instructional alternative over another must be developed. Accountability raises some serious questions which must be answered:

(a) What can we accomplish with the money that is made available for education?

(b) What do parents want their children to learn in school?

(c) What should public education provide?

(d) What end-product is being realized in education as a result of the money being put in, the time that the children put in, and the expertise that the educators put in?

2. INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL COMPETENCY

Personnel training for teachers and administrators. Upgrading leadership skill at all agency levels. Leadership skills in a bilingual/bicultural situation are a concern.

3. FACILITIES MAINTENANCE, RENOVATION AND CONSTRUCTION

4. PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT

   Talent in highly professional and technical fields must be recruited continuously from overseas. Territory lacks large reservoir of human resources to recruit from.

5. DIFFICULTIES IN IMPLEMENTING FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

   Criteria relative to federally funded programs were written and designed solely with stateside conditions in mind. Thus, our agency must attempt to fit our own unique situation into a program designed primarily on stateside conditions. Some of the difficulties experienced by our agency (and other territories as well) in complying with federal laws in education are illustrated as follow:

   (a) Funding agencies are often biased in favor of values and interests manifested by larger and more persuasive states. Congressmen and other lobby groups are influential for the states but our Territory lacks this political influence except for some of our few sympathetic friends in Congress. This, of course, results in some programs being culturally insensitive to territorial needs.

   (b) Proposal filing date always presents a problem. The guidelines submitted to us are usually either delayed or lost in the mail. This results in insufficient time between receipt of guidelines and required date.

   (c) The communication gap is obvious as the great distance prevents instant communication with the appropriate funding agencies. Sometimes the funding agencies forget to send application forms and guidelines.

(d) Many projects require constant monitoring. Feedbacks from monitors are seldom helpful for program improvement. This is due to either no on-site visits by monitors or unfamiliarity of monitors with programs upon arrival.

(e) Parental Advisory Council is always a problem in our society. One of the prevailing difficulties is the complete lack of communication among ranking members of the community in the Council and non-ranking members.

(f) Matching requirements are a problem especially in a territory like American Samoa where most of its budget derives from congressional appropriation.

(g) Competitive bidding requirements result in delay of project implementation which in return results in loss of funding. Due to distance and identification purposes, the sole source justification is more desirable.

6. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION OF CAREER EDUCATION AND ADULT BASIC EDUCATION.

7. OVERSEAS RECOGNITION OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

   A certification program for our classroom teachers has been implemented, the uniqueness of territorial situations and the element of isolation taken into consideration. What are the chances for such certification to be recognized stateside?

8. EXPANSION AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT UPON FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS.

   Federally funded programs which have been implemented have shown successful results. These programs must be expanded accordingly and continuously assessed for further improvement.

ARIZONA

Carolyn Warner
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Education is more than a public service--education is a public trust. This understanding is the basis for the Arizona Department of Education's thrusts. The Department seeks to utilize all available resources to provide even more effective, improved educational services. Certain basic needs are recognized, especially competency in what has been called the six R's:

Reading,	Rights,
'Riting,	Responsibilities,
'Rithmetic,	Respect.

Both academic and human concerns are reflected in these six R's. Successful attainment of these six R's should enable students to derive personal satisfaction and successfully contribute with reality in the "real world."

The following is a list of some of the concerns in education in Arizona. These concerns are viewed as opportunities to improve education. The Department has categorized these concerns although they interrelate and overlap in actual practice. The categories are: 1) student needs, 2) personnel, 3) school relationships, 4) curriculum, 5) finance, 6) legal.

STUDENT NEEDS: Career Awareness, Student Responsibility, Education for Minorities, Compensatory Education, Worth Ethic, Alternative Education, Dropout Alleviation, Human Relations Skills, Mandatory Special Education, Bilingual Education, Student Population Age, Career Exploration, Mobility, Truancy, Citizenship (Rights, Responsibilities, Respects), Career Preparation, Basic Survival Skills (Reading, Writing, Arithmetic), Preparation for an Adult Society.

PERSONNEL: Administrator Renewal, Teacher Negotiations, Commitment, Teacher Accountability, Responding to Needs of Pre-service and Inservice Teacher Training.

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS: Community Involvement, Parent Education, Alternative Education, Public Information, Local Control, Education for Minorities, Adult Education.

CURRICULUM: Community Education, Citizenship (Rights, Responsibilities, Respects), Education for Minorities, Basic Survival Skills (Reading, Writing, Arithmetic), Worth Ethic, Cross-Discipline, Human Relations Skills, Parent Education, Early Childhood (Age 5-), Bilingual Education, Measuring Student Achievement, Mobility, Career Exploration, Open Entry-Open Exit, Student Leadership, Articulation Between Levels to Eliminate Redundancy, Adult Education, Equal Educational Opportunity, Career Preparation.

FINANCE: Declining and Increasing Enrollments, Lateness of Funding Authorization, Inadequacy of Funding Appropriations, Indian Education, Mobility, Service to Rural Education, Funding for Innovative Projects, Cost/Effectiveness, Deflated Purchasing Power.

LEGAL: Extended School Year, Education for Minorities, School Time (Minutes, Days, Beginning/Ending Age), Students' Rights, Parents' Rights, Teachers' Rights, Collective Bargaining, Mandatory Special Education, Court Decisions, Recordkeeping, Paperflow Reduction, Local Control, Open Entry-Open Exit, Governance of Education, Service to Rural Education, Working Relationship (Federal, State and Local), School District Reorganization, Equal Educational Opportunity, Public Education (Right or Privilege), School Liability.

COLORADO

Calvin M. Frazier
State Commissioner of Education

The following represents ten critical state issues as reflected in the Colorado State Board and Department of Education priorities. Approximately

every two years we are attempting to identify such a list as our basis for the state budget request and federal applications.

1. IMPROVEMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL PLANNING:

One of the high priorities of our state has been to assist each school district under the provisions of the State Accountability Act to have a systematic way of establishing short and long-range objectives, priorities, programs to achieve these objectives, evaluation commitments, and a procedure for annually reporting to the public on progress in these areas. From the local level objectives and priorities we at the State Department prepare an overview of the major needs and interests of the state as a basis for our presentation to the state legislature. Development of the local expertise and the procedures whereby this cycle is carried out has been a major focus in the last few years.

USOE/Federal Implications: The federal dollars coming to the state through ESEA Title V and now the new Title IV have been most critical to implementing this planning process. It would seem that the USOE ought to be most interested in collecting the priorities of the states and territories as a way of initiating leadership practices at the federal level and preparing recommendations to Congress. If this were a federal interest, states would be encouraged to be more systematic in their statement of objectives and priorities. An excellent base would be laid for meaningful communication and direction to legislative and executive offices.

2. STATE COLLECTION OF DATA AND INTERNAL MANAGEMENT TO ACHIEVE STATE PRIORITIES:

In support of the first objective of state planning, there has been a major effort to streamline the data collection and reporting by and to the Colorado Department of Education. In addition, a program-type budget has been developed with specific objectives listed and the dollars necessary to achieve these objectives. There is monitoring of these projects and the final reporting of the outcome of these objectives back to the legislature and the Executive Office at the time of the next budget review. Although still not of high quality, the cycle is improving each year.

USOE/Federal Implications: The USOE stimulation to states to enhance their internal management ability would be a meaningful commitment. Through existing meetings such as the June USOE meeting, the CCSSO meeting, and other sessions for chief state school officers, the USOE could promote a focus on department management improvement. Exchanges between states might be encouraged in such a way that the leadership of a state department has an opportunity to observe first-hand the manner in which each department operates. Such exchanges might be stimulated by specific federal grants and/or even promoted and planned by Regional USOE offices. USOE people could participate and add the federal relations dimension during such exchanges.

3. REVISION OF STATE FINANCE ACT PROVISIONS:

Much headway was made in the adoption of the 1973 Colorado School Finance Act. The State will be examining this area again

in the coming legislative interim studies. A major consideration will center around the equalizing of assessments in the state, inasmuch as the property tax is still one of the cornerstones of our foundation program. The second major issue will be one of bringing many of our state categorical programs, e.g., Handicapped Children's Educational Act and Bilingual Education Act, into a closer relationship to the regular, ongoing school foundation program.

USOE/Federal Implications: Federal appropriations to states to do a review of their finance plans would be most helpful at this point. As more and more states become involved in such an evaluation, there should be a place for some regional USOE meetings to bring department and state finance planners together to consider new funding approaches. The Education Commission of the States does some of this but the USOE ought to be the primary resource and facilitator.

4. TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS:

Another high priority for our state in the coming twelve months will be the development of standards and an institutional evaluation plan for professional preparation programs. Legislative changes in teacher certification were accomplished in this last session. Part of the Act requires systematic evaluation of all teacher education programs by follow-up contact with graduates after they have been in the field. A major concern is also developing over the problems posed by very little turnover of personnel in a local school district. The continued growth of such personnel is probably going to be part of a major thrust by the Board/Department in the coming year.

USOE/Federal Implications: It seems that state and national attention on teacher education programs has diminished some in recent years. The federal level has not given this a major focus and it may be a good time to step up activities in this area. It could be that the "teacher center" concept for postgraduate and inservice work should be explored again. State and federal stimulus is needed if we are to explore new programs to achieve faculty and staff growth. Some resources are available through the State Title IV dollars but an additional national focus is needed.

5. COORDINATION OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EFFORTS WITH OTHER STATE AGENCIES:

Societal efforts to solve various social, physical, and psychological problems have emphasized some of the overlapping efforts of state agencies. Common data systems, better tracking and transfer policies, and cooperative planning between state decision makers have been factors creating more opportunities for education but also some time-consuming interactions. Coordinated societal planning has a great potential and is a Board/Department priority.

USOE/Federal Implications: It appears that more grants are being made available from federal sources to further coordinate human service delivery services. This should be continued and encouraged. Federal agencies should set examples of interagency cooperation whenever possible.

6. PROVISIONS FOR EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY:

By relating the EEO efforts to accountability and accreditation programs and reports, greater progress has been made in encouraging

Colorado school districts to give attention to this area. Affirmative action, due process, and general recognition of recent court trends remain a major challenge for many educational units. The Department has held joint meetings with federal and state civil rights agencies and a better feeling exists between these groups as the understanding level has risen.

USOE/Federal Implications: More coordination is needed between the civil rights related thrusts of the Office of Civil Rights, Civil Rights Commission, the Civil Rights Office under the Justice Department, and the Equal Educational Opportunity office. Perhaps this unification can be accomplished through the Regional Offices, although there seem to be jurisdictional obstacles to the attainment of this coordination at this time. Secondly, a critical need exists for NIE leadership in identifying those factors and programs that effectively increase educational opportunity for all students.

7. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM NEEDS:

Colorado has focused in recent years on Handicapped Children's programs, Bilingual Education, and Career Education. With a separate Occupational and Vocational Department, one of the state efforts has been a greater coordination of the two. The major program interests now developing would relate to upgrading guidance/counseling and media programs, assessment of gifted and talented program possibilities, and continuation of Right to Read projects. An overriding public concern seems to be the question--"Are schools doing a better job today than they were five, ten, fifteen years ago?"

USOE/Federal Implications: Through Title IV funding, a state has considerable flexibility in establishing its priorities. This should be continued as a pattern of support. Is there some way USOE/NIE can assist in achieving better program evaluation by local districts and possibly relating state/local evaluation to the National Assessment project?

8. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT:

A major Board/Department commitment has been made to promote growth of the state's administrative leadership (including State Department personnel). Collegial Teams have been organized and many discussions held as to ways to increase formal/informal learning among leaders. An extension will be begun this year to include local lay leadership on school boards and key advisory committees. Deans of schools of education and other higher education personnel have been of great assistance. Established administrative preparation and inservice programs have not been reduced necessarily but reevaluated as to their effectiveness for developing creative, responsive leaders.

USOE/Federal Implications: No major involvement would appear to be needed at this time. This issue could be a part of a USOE re-emphasis on teacher education. A real need exists to relate some of the work findings and personnel of regional labs and administrative centers (such as the Center at the University of Oregon) to this need for leadership development. Too many of these efforts seem to go on an unrelated path.

9. REASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITY USE:

Colorado has begun to look at state responsibilities relative to lifelong learning needs of the population. It is felt by some

that greater flexibility is needed to provide each community with a wider range of programs to serve preschool needs through retirement age interests. With a drop in enrollment in over half of the state's school districts, space is becoming available. Interest in the community school concept, adult retraining programs, and exploratory opportunities in general is on the increase.

USOE/Federal Implications: No special role is visualized at this time. Community Schools legislation would be of assistance.

10. UTILIZATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS AND A BROADER COMMITMENT TO JUDGE EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS:

One of Colorado's major needs is that of expertise and commitment to evaluate the impact of the school experience on students, parents, and professional staff. Were this component to be fully appreciated, a built-in correction and creativeness would exist in our school programs. Budget priorities (locally, state and nationally) would be more defensible. Through the Accountability Act we are attempting to bring about growth in this area, but it remains one of our major unmet needs.

USOE/Federal Implications: It is critical that national research and dissemination efforts be unified as at least a stable base for addressing this nationwide problem. NIE efforts and USOE projects should be harmonized as much as possible. NIE must be a stimulus/facilitator of local and state growth to do and utilize research and evaluation. This inservice and leadership role of NIE may be as important as the actual research findings.

District and state personnel involvement in NIE efforts, through sabbatical and internships (leaves of absence), should be utilized whenever possible.

Commissioner's View of Nationwide Issues

POSTURE OF USOE

A. Under the present Commissioner, USOE has assumed a greater role as a spokesman for desirable educational programs and legislation. This is a welcome trend and should be continued as a means of clarifying national priorities in education and the appropriate federal role in respect to these priorities.

B. The Regional USOE Offices should be utilized more as dissemination vehicles for USOE and NIE findings and projects. This particular state commissioner sees the Regional Associate Commissioner as being a means for promoting a dialogue between the states of the region and sponsoring meaningful educational conferences and projects.

C. One of the most important responsibilities of the USOE is to support those programs and legislative proposals that enhance the capability of the states and local school districts to solve educational problems. Creative solutions and change must be fostered at the lowest level possible in our organizational hierarchy. Legislation that seeks to be too specific and controlling at the federal level may restrict potential growth of alternatives and ultimately hurt students and education in general. It is hoped that the USOE and State Departments of Education can be mindful of such a danger.

CANAL ZONE

David Speir
Superintendent of Schools

PROBLEM: Increasing numbers of Spanish-speaking children in the U.S.-citizen schools.

OBJECTIVE: To provide instruction in the English language for such children so that they will profit more from the educational program of the school; to instruct such children adequately without detracting from the instruction of the English-speaking children.

Indicators: There are substantial and increasing numbers of sponsored shildren who come to school unable to be taught effectively in the regular classroom because of language deficiency. These are primarily military dependents-Puerto Ricans and those with Panamanian mothers. We already have some Panamanian Spanish teachers helping these pupils make a transition to English, but not enough.

Proposed Actions:

1. Transfer additional teachers from the Latin American Schools who are presently excess because of decreasing enrollments.
2. Purchase of a structural language development program to be designated as the core for this curriculum.
3. In-service training for these teachers to handle the children described above.
4. Inclusion of many of these children in a pre-kindergarten summer school session.
5. Expansion of summer program for these students in grades 1-6.

6. Pilot programs to explore other alternatives for this population, e.g. an orientation room program (language deficient child would enter an all day program to be handled in both languages with English language proficiency as its goal. Students would then be moved to a regular classroom when this was accomplished).

PROBLEM: Accelerating pace of curriculum change.

Indicators: The rate at which the curriculum in our schools has adjusted to the rapid changes in our society is still too slow. During the last year, significant changes in the content of English classes have been made. The secondary English program is being transformed into a wide range of single semester elective courses. Smaller enrollment has limited the number of new courses at Cristobal High as has limited funds for the purchase of new texts. Nevertheless, curriculum development has not taken place at the speed anticipated a year ago. Money was not available for research and development. Budget cuts eliminated plans to obtain consultants, to purchase new curriculum materials, to encourage participation by staff members to attend meetings in the United States, and to develop in-service training.

Proposed Actions: A new position in the central office for research and development has been established. The research and development officer will work with the Director of Curriculum to plan and coordinate curriculum changes. The objectives to be sought are a wider range of offerings, more flexibility in adapting the program to individual needs and

capacity, and less rigidity in the mode and manner of instruction. A comprehensive re-evaluation of the total secondary curriculum structure and instructional techniques is appropriate. Topics that need special consideration are ecological balance and environmental pollution, international relations and human relations, the impact of science and technology in the future of our society, and career education as a new focus for curriculum.

PROBLEM: Increasing number of children who are emotionally disturbed.

Indicators: The number of children with serious emotional problems has continued to increase for the past several years. These children not only are not learning properly, but the disturbance they cause in class decreases the amount to be learned by others.

A recent study of the kindergarten population indicates that 31% of the pupils have learning and behavioral disorders. A related study conducted a decade ago in the Canal Zone revealed a 10% prevalence figure. This represents a 20% increase in students with learning and behavioral disorders.

Proposed Actions: Teachers must be provided additional guidance by psychologists and social workers, who will also give counseling to the children and their parents. Special classes may need to be established in certain schools for children with severe emotional problems. These classes must be staffed by special teachers on a volunteer basis, teachers who either already have or are provided training related to the task. The Division of Schools will study the need and insert a budget item to begin work in this area. Consultant services will be needed.

Students certified as eligible for services in this category frequently need placement in a full-time special class until sufficient progress is made in their adjustment and achievement for them to be returned to a regular class. Supportive services are also needed to assist teachers in managing effectively the children in the special and regular classes.

PROBLEM: Staffing - numbers.

OBJECTIVE: Provide additional staffing to operate a superior educational program.

Indicators: Present Situation: The following additional professional staff positions are badly needed:

1. Additional counselors/educational prescriptions at Curundu Jr. High School, Balboa High School, Cristobal Jr.-Sr. High School.
2. An additional assistant principal at Cristobal Jr.-Sr. High School.
3. Additional librarians/media specialists at Balboa High School and Curundu Jr. High School.
4. Full-time nurse for Curundu Jr. High School, Balboa High School, and Cristobal Jr.-Sr. High School.
5. Twelve class 15 teachers to implement Middle States recommendation of providing department chairpersons with time during the school day to function in an effective manner.
6. Additional reading consultants at Balboa High School and Cristobal Jr.-Sr. High School.
7. Activity coordinators for Balboa High School, Curundu Jr. High School, and Cristobal Jr.-Sr. High School.

8. Sufficient Class 15 teachers to maintain a Pupil Teacher Ratio of 22.5.

The following additional positions have been recommended at Canal Zone College by consultants from the Middle States Association:

1 Dean of Instruction

1 Instructor, Social Science

1 Instructor, Science-Math

1 Instructor, Art

1 Counselor

1 Librarian

1 Instructor, Business Administration

2 Para-professional instructional media assistants

1 Library Technician

1 Clerk-Typist

The following additional positions are needed in the U.S. Elementary Schools:

10 Librarians/Media Specialists

14 Clerks/Library Assistants

2 Reading Consultants

7 Language Development Teachers

1 Music Teacher

1 Art Teacher

PROBLEM: Recruitment - quality of applicants

Indicators: There are insufficient numbers of available applicants on existing registers to assure quality teaching personnel in the schools, and tenders of employment are made too late to obtain those available.

Proposed Actions: Much more advertising should be done for teachers. Registers should be pared of all unusable candidates. There should be enough persons on the register to enable high quality selection. Since most needs are known by the end of December, tenders of employment should begin to be made shortly thereafter. Every effort should be made to extend all employment tenders for the coming school year before the March 15 contract date in the United States, to avoid unethical pressure to have teachers break signed contracts. It may also be desirable to establish a position of "personnel coordinator" in the Schools Division Central Office to supervise the preparation and execution of personnel action requests, to handle much of the routine now taking up time of assistant superintendents, and to serve as liaison with the Personnel Bureau.

PROBLEM: Year-round schooling in the Canal Zone.

OBJECTIVE: To provide additional educational opportunity for Canal Zone children; to better utilize present school vacation periods; to enable Panama Canal home leave to be better scheduled; to compensate for the breaks in schooling occasioned by PCS of military personnel.

Indicators: Employment needs of the Panama Canal makes it virtually impossible to schedule U.S. employees with children for leave only during school vacation periods. Also transfers in and out of the schools by military dependents pose great educational problems for those transferring, other pupils, and the teaching staff. The situation is more than an inconvenience, and results in real decrease in educational quality for many persons.

The G.A.C.O.E. did form a committee to study the year round school. Unfortunately, the committee never met. The chairman stated that he would submit his individual report.

Two members of the committee that was formed spoke to the GACOE at one of their monthly meetings on year-round schooling. At the close of the meeting the thought was to accept the chairman's report and put the whole idea to bed as something not workable for the Canal Zone.

A plan can be worked out without too much difficulty for the secondary schools. Due to the various sizes and enrollments in the elementary schools, so far it has been impossible to come up with a plan.

Proposed Actions: The G.A.C.O.E. needs to form another committee to conduct an in depth study of the feasibility, advisability, and acceptability of the year-round school. There are administrative and staffing difficulties to overcome, community acceptance to develop, and budget preparation needed before such a change can be made. At least two years would seem necessary to plan and implement such a schedule change, and it might best be phased in experimentally in some schools at first.

CONNECTICUT

Mark R. Shedd
State Commissioner of Education

State education agencies--with the support and cooperation of the U.S. Office of Education--are commissioned to serve the end purpose of education; providing learning opportunities which meet the diverse aspirations,

concerns, interests, learning styles, and needs of each individual child and young person.

Each of the following pages takes up an educational purpose to which state education agencies and USOE can address themselves in their efforts to help improve education in the states.

Every state education agency has played, is playing, and will continue to play a part in the pursuit of each of these educational purposes.

None of these purposes can ever be completely, lastingly, and perfectly attained. But each purpose is approachable, and the challenge of trying to come as close to realizing each one as is humanly possible should be taken up by state and federal education agencies with enthusiasm, perseverance, and zeal.

I. Educational Finance

The amount of money spent per pupil is widely acknowledged as an essential factor in the breadth of educational opportunity a school system provides. Breadth of educational opportunity, in turn, is widely acknowledged as one important measure of quality in education.

Even those who hold that no one can prove a direct relationship between the amount spent on education and the value received are hard put to disprove this argument.

Whatever positions people take on the relationship between educational expenditures and educational quality, the fact is that the present educational finance systems in this country are not conducive to equality in educational opportunity.

Great inequalities in learning opportunities exist between the schools of every community in every state and between the schools of the various states as well.

These inequalities exist chiefly because of the inequities in the educational finance systems under which the schools must operate.

In more than a score of states, including Connecticut, the percentage of state aid to local education is below the national average. In 37 states, the state is less than an equal partner in sharing local education costs. In 27 states, the main burden of financing education is on local communities. Thus, there are, in many states, thousands of glaring disparities in educational opportunities between communities.

Communities with low property tax wealth, no matter how hard they try, cannot provide educational programs and services equal in depth, quality, or scope to those provided by communities with high property tax wealth. The ill-favored communities range all the way from the largest of cities to the smallest of towns.

To move toward equity of educational opportunity, states should adopt educational finance systems designed to help communities deal with educational needs which are beyond their capacity to meet. The aim of such systems should be to bring the states into positions of equal partnership with communities in sharing educational costs. Such a development should not, and need not, lead to any dissipation of local autonomy in school governance. Rather, local-state partnerships--in which the state manifests its recognition that communities differ widely in their ability to support education--would be a source of strength for education at the very places mutually agreed upon as most in need of strengthening.

Restructuring of educational finance systems would be further enhanced through greater federal participation. A strong federal-state-local partnership would do much to assure far greater equity of local educational opportunity.

II. Planning and Evaluation

As major links in the education accountability chain, state education agencies must constantly improve their capabilities in planning and evaluation. Even the SEA's which are most well-favored when it comes to technological sophistication must stay on the lookout for better ways to get, study, and use information for the statewide improvement of instruction.

It is through planning and evaluation that individual teachers become better prepared to deal with the diverse needs, concerns, and learning styles of individual learners. It is through planning and evaluation that school administrators become better able to coordinate the efforts of their staffs. It is through planning and evaluation that school system administrators become better able to coordinate the efforts of their central office staffs. And it is through planning and evaluation that state education agencies get a composite picture of local district progress and problems so that state educators can contribute their expertise to the improvement of instruction.

Planning and evaluation are distinct but interdependent activities. Planning feeds into evaluation and evaluation feeds into planning in a never-ending cycle. It is imperative, therefore, that educators at all levels work together to determine their specific needs for planning and evaluation information; to decide how best to get this information to one another; and to apply this information in ways which will keep the planning--evaluation process in smooth running order.

Where state education agencies are concerned, all this implies the need for highly developed management information systems and for statewide master planning efforts which lend themselves to constant evaluation and revision. Good management information systems need good ingredients--information which is basic, relevant, and sound; clear objectives to plan for and measure against; technical know-how and capacity; and efficient

dissemination methods to insure that plans and evaluative results are used to best advantage.

State education agencies need to improve their ability to do both short-term and long-term planning. They need to know the basic dimensions of current state systems of education to determine how to keep them healthy over the next five years. They need to prepare themselves also to take a critical and imaginative view of which economic, psychological, and social trends are likely to become influences upon education ten, fifteen, and twenty years from now.

State-regional-local partnerships in planning and evaluation should reflect the same type of cooperation and coordination which goes into the restructuring of educational finance systems. The end purpose of both endeavors, after all, is the improvement of instruction.

III. Professional Development

Declining enrollments offer state education agencies the opportunity to expand and strengthen their leadership role in the professional development of teachers, administrators, and other school personnel.

When enrollments were rising rapidly and teacher shortages were chronic, the emphasis in professional development was on preservice preparation.

Now, with fewer new teachers entering the schools, teachers in service make up a larger and larger percentage of the total teaching force.

These teachers--from the ones with a couple of years of experience to the ones with twenty, thirty, or more years of experience--stand to benefit greatly from well-conceived and well-presented inservice education activities. It can safely be assumed that the great majority of these teachers want to take part in a broader range of inservice activities than

have been available to them in the past. What's more, they want to be actively and directly involved in the planning and presentation of such activities.

An abundance of knowledge, skills, and talents is waiting to be tapped among working educators. Teachers want to share what they know and what they can do with their colleagues. They want to help other teachers and to receive help themselves.

State education agencies can facilitate opportunities for teachers and other school personnel to improve themselves. In this endeavor, state educators should consider the potential of inservice activities beyond traditional approaches which have provided a relatively low yield. State educators should view inservice education as akin to good education for all learners--that is, view it as starting with learners where they are.

This view would require pegging professional development to the situational needs, both present and prospective, of the participants in inservice activities. Such activities need to be presented in ways which teachers find applicable to the challenges they encounter every day. It follows that, for such activities to be effective, teachers have to be involved deeply in their development. Like men and women in other career fields, teachers want to find satisfaction in their work. They want to work in organizations which recognize, nurture, and are supportive of their knowledge and skills. They welcome having their talents drawn up in the cause of improved instruction, and they look with favor upon involvement in such forms as participatory management and shared decision-making.

State education agencies should develop a greater capacity to provide leadership and assistance to local school systems in their inservice

education activities. In this effort, state educators should help local educators identify resources available through regional educational service centers, higher education institutions, libraries, hospitals, industry, and other agencies.

IV. Career Preparation

The changing nature of the world of work, and of the persons in the world of work, must be treated by state education agencies as matters of great concern. The entire relationship between the school and the workplace has to be rethought with an eye both toward adjusting to today's realities and toward preparing young people for what the best foresight says will be tomorrow's realities.

This rethinking must involve the preparation of all children and young people--whether they plan to work after graduation from high school or after postsecondary education of some type.

Rethinking the school-workplace relationship implies strongly the need for statewide master planning for vocational and career education.

Vocational programs--whether in state or regional vocational schools or in vocational programs in comprehensive high schools--must be reevaluated constantly to make sure they are in tune with the fields in which there are jobs and in which there are likely to be jobs.

The education of all children and young people must be designed with an eye to making it broad enough so that none of them will be locked into dissatisfying or shrinking job markets.

Though schools cannot make boring jobs interesting, they can help young people acquire knowledge and skills which will give them the flexibility and resourcefulness they need to leave uninspiring jobs for better and more satisfying jobs.

State education agencies, while maintaining and strengthening vocational programs of proven lasting merit, should at the same time explore possibilities in new or expanded work-study programs and other career preparation alternatives. They should also help local school districts in their efforts to keep young people out of the no-man's land between academically-oriented and vocationally-oriented education.

Career education--infused as a concept throughout the entire curriculum, not as a detached discipline--should be fostered as widely as good sense indicates. Each career education element--awareness, exploration, preparation, and counseling--should be implemented so that it unfolds in logical progression, providing each young person with a sense of direction. Yet even as the individual's sense of direction is crystalizing, it should be subjected to constant review both in the light of changing realities in occupational fields and in the light of changing perceptions by the individual.

The career preparation goal should be to help the individual make enlightened choices.

V. Students' Needs

At the same time that they are laying great stress on individualized education, educators are discovering that children and young people are more different from one another than they had ever imagined.

The schools have done a great deal, particularly during the past ten years, to respond to the needs, aspirations, and learning styles of many different groups of students.

Programs and services abound for the poor, the handicapped, the retarded, the emotionally disturbed, the non-English speaking, and those of diverse ethnic heritage.

Yet, today, the demand goes beyond this type of responsiveness. Even those who by demographic and other statistical measures were once identified as typical are now seen as spanning an enormous range of differences where learning needs are concerned.

The schools, then, are faced with the task of becoming far more responsive than ever. They need to make available a whole set of alternative learning environments, programs, teaching styles, and options.

But the creation of these alternatives and options are just one of four broad areas of priority of which schools should be mindful. The other priorities are: guaranteeing that every student attains basic literacy, occupational competency, and civic responsibility; maintaining high standards of excellence in all instructional programs; and acknowledging the need to honor the rights of students in the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Alternatives and options are particularly critical at the secondary level where the student demand is the greatest and where the complexity of large high school organizations frequently constrains flexibility in programming.

State education agencies--working in partnership with local school systems in the fields of teacher development, curriculum development, and management systems development--can help schools become more responsive to the needs of students. Among approaches worthy of exploration are flexible patterns of staff deployment, flexible uses of student time, year-round use of school facilities, out-of-school location for learning activities, wider use of television, computer-assisted instruction, and other applications of technology in the teaching-learning process.

DELAWARE

Kenneth C. Madden
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Part A lists the critical problems in Delaware at the present; Part B is a listing of objectives assigned to the department staff seeking solutions to those problems; Part C is a list of recommendations for Office of Education consideration.

Part A

The major educational problems in Delaware, as I see them, are the following:

1. Interdistrict Remedy for Desegregation of Wilmington Public Schools

   A sizeable part of the department staff is devoting full time to the development of interdistrict plans in compliance with a federal court order. Ten school districts are involved and it is the major interdistrict plan before federal courts at this time. The fiscal costs connected with plans proposed are staggering, in that we obviously face a leveling up process in regard to staff salaries and expenditure levels. The sociological part of the plan, involving human relations workshops and inservice training for pupils, staff and board members, likewise taxes available funds.

2. Mandatory Education for All Exceptional Children, Ages 0-21

   Preparation in advance of legislation for mandatory education of all exceptional children, ages 0-21, is underway with activities planned in the following areas:

   --identification of unserved and underserved;

   --diagnosis and evaluation of children identified in statewide search;

--pilot program development for service delivery to all exceptional children 0-21 not presently being served;

--assessing data collected in regard to development and adoption of proposed legislation.

3. Insufficient State Funding for LEA's to Offset Inflationary Costs

Inflationary costs in a recession period for fuel and electricity are familiar problems everywhere. This issue is a serious financial problem in Delaware, since revenue projections are down and funds are not available to keep pace with inflationary costs. School districts must rob money from school supplies and equipment or salary accounts to pay fixed costs of fuel and electricity.

4. Insufficient State Funding for Equalization to Reduce Differences in Funding Per Pupil Among LEA's

Delaware has a high percentage of state support (70%), but differences in local funds varies from the richest district to the poorest district by a ratio of 10 to 1. Each year improvement has been made in state equalization funding to reduce this difference, but low revenue projections for fiscal '76 preclude any improvement in equalization funding. (Variances in total expenditures for education among school districts in Delaware is 2 to 1).

5. Clarification of Roles of State Board - Local Boards of Education

With the advent of student rights, EEOC procedures, etc., more State Board intervention has taken place than formerly. This has aroused considerable concern about both the legal and appropriate role of the State Board as it relates to powers formerly considered local boards of education. A special committee has been appointed to clarify roles and a consultant has been engaged to lead the study.

6. Image of Education and Educators

The education community today does not enjoy a high rating among parents, citizens-at-large, and legislators. Problems of discipline, concern about progress of students, vandalism, student disruptors, high taxes, and the present Wilmington desegregation suit all combine to make a very tense situation in our state. Failure of tax referenda is commonplace.

7. Jealousy of Other State Agencies of the Legislative Clout of School Administrators and Boards of Education

All agencies in Delaware, with the exception of education, are headed by a cabinet secretary. The education establishment is thus free to lobby independent of the budget recommendations of the Executive Branch. I meet monthly with all school superintendents and working with the School Boards Association we have developed a powerful lobby. As a result of the fiscal situation in Delaware for fiscal '76, all agencies have been required to take a 2% cut from the original budget recommendations. The education lobby has been able to have its cut reduced to .5%. This obviously has caused much bitterness and considerable jealousy of the power of educators. While we want to retain this independence, it is, nevertheless, a continuing irritant to other agency heads and makes coordination and cooperation difficult.

This raises the point in my mind about the ability of the Office of Education to ever truly speak on a national level for the needs of education. As presently constituted, and even under a separate cabinet position for education, the Administration's budget will have to be presented and supported. The education establishment under this system will always be at odds with the Office of Education,

unless there is a President or Budget Director in tune with the needs of education. Some way should be found for OE to have the independence to speak for the needs of education at the national level.

8. Lack of Funding for Massive Inservice Training Programs for Teachers and Administrators

The major unstated problem in Delaware is and has been the real need for improvement of instruction. The practice in education of teachers receiving one training period in their lifetime is inconceivable in today's world. Education has devised all kinds of organizational schemes and gimmicks to improve education; but in my opinion, real improvement will only be made when we require teachers and administrators periodically to become involved in a retraining program to update their skills and techniques. We do not have the funding at the state level to do this and recommendations in Part C speak more specifically to this.

9. Inadequate Coordination of Health and Education Needs of Children Among State Agencies

This is a problem in Delaware to which we have addressed ourselves, as indicated in Part B of this paper. Many programs exist for the education of children in various state and federal agencies, but to date we have not given adequate attention to coordination of programs and planning efforts.

10. Problems Brought About By Declining Enrollments

Serious problems exist with regard to reduction of staff as a result of declining enrollments. EEOC regulations relating to minorities and women present problems which have not

been resolved at this time. Related to this area are use of buildings no longer needed for education, early retirement, and reduction of class size and/or use of additional specialists for remedial or enrichment purposes.

Part B

The following issues have been identified as educational objectives in Delaware and will receive priority in terms of staff effort and available funding:

1. Implementation, evaluation, and refinement of educational delivery system for the severely mentally retarded, who were formerly in day-time care centers.
2. Implementation, evaluation, and modification of exemplary program as set forth in the State Plan for Vocational Education of the Handicapped.
3. Development and implementation of guidelines for providing educational alternatives for students with special behavioral problems.
4. Modification through continued development and implementation of curriculum activities of the Human Relations project as part of educational and sociological concerns relative to court-ordered redistricting of the public schools in New Castle County.
5. Field testing of acceptable organizational and instructional programs standards for elementary education, K-4 and/or K-6.
6. Corrective action training sessions with teachers resulting from the reporting of the statewide testing scores to assure better understanding and commitment to subject area improvement. Further refinement of the Delaware Educational Accountability System.

7. Coordination of leadership and program activities of the Right-to-Read project and the Delaware Reading Center to insure improved impact on the development of basic reading instruction.
8. Development and implementation of a comprehensive curriculum guide for vocational and career education exploratory programs in the middle schools.
9. Development of programs to improve the image of education and educators with parents, public in general, and legislators.
10. Clarification of roles of State Board/Local Boards in terms of responsibility for educational matters.
11. Delineation of rules of State Education Department/School Districts and the Department of Health and Social Services for the health and education of exceptional children from ages 0-21.
12. Refinement of the Career Education concept.
13. Development of a program as follows to insure equal educational opportunities for all children who have been identified as having different or exceptional abilities:
    a. To develop and implement a search and census system which screens and counts all unserved and underserved handicapped children, 0-21, by May 1, 1976.
    b. To develop and implement an identification system which validates 25% of the searched and screened population and refers all school age children to LEA programs by June 30, 1976, and the other 75% of the population by December 30, 1976.
    c. To develop by January 30, 1977, a report for the State Board of Education which provides accurate program and budget figures for mandatory special education as it relates to the handicapped children searched, screened and validated.

d. To develop and implement pilot programs in the LEA's for identified and validated one to six year old handicapped children by June 30, 1976.

e. To provide for the orderly phase-in of the Daytime Care Center population of students into the special schools of the state by September 1, 1975.

f. To develop and implement a feasibility study of providing programs for deaf children in downstate Delaware.

14. Development of a manpower needs assessment system to be used as a basis for new program implementation, existing program deletion and/or programs revision correlated with manpower needs.

15. Development of performance based curriculum guides for all vocational areas offered by vocational-technical schools.

16. Refinement of monitoring, evaluation, and dissemination capabilities of the education department.

17. Provision of leadership and coordination of state and local activities in preparation for the Bicentennial.

18. Refinement of plans for school facilities use in a period of declining school enrollments.

19. Clarification of fiscal responsibility (state/local) for extra state costs for local salary supplements and persons employed fully from local tax funds.

20. Refinement of efforts to achieve a greater measure of equalization of funding among the school districts of the state and improvement of state funding at all levels to offset inflationary costs.

Part C

The following are critical problems which relate to federal funding of education and are submitted as my recommendations for consideration by the Office of Education staff:

1. OE Should Establish a National Educational Policies Commission

The purpose of such a commission would be to establish educational priorities, be the voice for education, and in effect, be the major educational planning agency. The commission should be staffed with outstanding educators, philosophers, economists and such others as would be considered appropriate. This would minimize the power of pressure groups to establish priorities both nationally and on the state level. This would help us in the states, since most pressure groups existing on the national level have a strong operational base at the state level also.

2. OE or NIE Should Establish and Fund Demonstration Schools for Massive Inservice Education of Teachers and Administrators

The need to upgrade teachers and administrators is so obvious that it hardly needs to be said, but it is not being done. We have countless educational problems and we count upon field grants, occasional workshops, coursework, or general reading for dissemination and implementation. In my opinion, it has not worked well and never will. I think teachers and administrators should periodically go through an extensive retraining program to upgrade their skills and techniques, and acquire new knowledge.

Industry has long since learned the value of retraining personnel at all levels including management. General Motors recently installed a new motor in their Buick automobile. Auto mechanics all over the country were brought in to demonstration

centers to learn to maintain the new motor. Since motors always react the same, given the same set of conditions, one could have assumed this was a needless expense.

But compare this with what we do in education. Teachers have one student teaching experience and then they are tossed with kids for the rest of their teaching life with little or no supervision and for most, little opportunity for upgrading. And kids aren't like motors; they are different every day.

And industry sends workers to training sessions at full salary and expenses. What a wonderful opportunity we now have with excess teachers to provide a permanent floating staff to replace teachers who should be sent to demonstration centers for a new learning opportunity.

I have in mind regional demonstration centers which would be staffed with the best practitioners and theoreticians available in today's market. I envision this experience for teachers at least every ten years.

For administrators, the situation is even worse. The majority has never even had an internship program and learn right on the job. Schools should be provided for them also.

3. <u>OE Should Establish a Commission to Evaluate Federal Aid to Education Programs</u>

Federal money is needed, but it is time for us to look at where we are and where we are going in terms of federal education programs. The 7% of education's costs provided from federal funds control an awful lot of our operation. We need to take a long hard look at the controls imposed by the little bit of money received. The constant threat of funds being withheld for this or that

reason is disturbing. The federal bureaucracy and all its power is frightening.

4. NIE Should Cease to Be a Grants Agency and Conduct Applied Research on the Real Needs of Education

In my opinion, the best brains in the country ought to be assembled to develop the programs, techniques, etc. which would then be disseminated through the demonstration centers mentioned in point 2 above. Presently, too many people untrained in research receive grants and the contributions in most cases are minimal.

Dozens of problems besetting teachers and administrators need the attention of experts rather than our present hit and miss approach.

5. OE Should Establish a Commission to Clarify the Roles of Federal/State Jurisdictions

Just as there is concern within our state for overlapping or unclear jurisdiction between state and local boards, there is the same with regard to the Office of Education and SEA's. Congress continues to add new programs and the Office of Education writes pages of new rules and regulations in the Federal Register.

Many problems are caused by federal regulations which create an unfavorable impression in the minds of the general public. In fact, restrictive regulations cause many people to question the worth of continued participation in federal programs. Admittedly, other agencies outside the Office of Education, such as EEOC, Civil Rights Office, and others, are the root cause more so than the OE.

My point, however, is that we are developing more federal controls all the time and American education is well on the way to losing its

uniqueness, local control by a Board of Education.

6. Changes in Existing OE Programs

The following is a list of suggestions for changes in existing OE or HEW Programs:

a. That an adequate floor (guaranteed allocation) be included for small states.

b. Forward funding should be put into effect based on minimal activity support.

c. Revision and amendment procedures should be clarified and made more efficient.

d. That local needs assessment data, primarily for LEA improvement, should be maintained.

e. New flexibility goals for "in kind" services.

f. More information and specificity in annual reports; also, more reliable data.

g. Take necessary action to assure that regulations and guidelines for additional programs are promptly developed and issued.

FLORIDA

Ralph D. Turlington
State Commissioner of Education

Collective Bargaining:

Passage of a federal collective bargaining law has become a major issue in the 94th Congress. As with any complex issue, a number of interrelated problems and contending positions are relevant to collective bargaining in the public sector. From our perspective, the two most important problems caused as a result of this issue are:

1. Preemption of State responsibility and authority by a federal statute in an area legally, historically and traditionally included within the parameters of State jurisdiction; and,
2. The pervasive, disruptive impact of a (proposed) federal collective bargaining law in polarizing and alienating complementary segments of the educational community.

The 1974 Florida legislature formulated a unique and comprehensive collective bargaining procedure to meet the needs of the State's educational structure and community. Thus, for Florida the issue of collective bargaining has already been resolved. Congress, however, seekd to impose uniform standards and conditions in collective bargaining situations inherently unique. Not only would Congress "preempt" State authority and responsibility, but it would also arbitrarily disrupt the "equilibrium" already established in each State. It is our position that the issue of collective bargaining is best resolved by each individual State, consistent with its unique educational development and structure.

Principle of State Involvement

Both Congress and the U.S. Office of Education must recognize and accept the context of federal, state, and local roles in education. Where federal and state roles meet, each level of government must assume a "partnership" perspective. Both state and local education agencies should be viewed in terms of cooperation by Congress, USOE, and other responsible executive agencies. Too often in the past, an adversary relationship has been the rule, rather than the exception. The concept of state-federal-local partnership should be emphasized and reinforced by Congress and USOE at every opportunity. State education agencies, as the primary responsible agencies for education, should be involved and participate in all levels and phases of the federal government, including: (1) all phases of the legislative process;

(2) the development and promulgation of rules, regulations and guidelines; and (3) the ongoing and continuous administration of federal education programs. Only when the "partnership" concept pervades all aspects of the federal-state relationship can the true impact of their combined effort be felt and appreciated.

Advisory Councils

Congress, as well as state education agencies, has long realized the importance of parental and lay involvement in the educational process. Both state and local education agencies have accepted and emphasized the concept of parent/community/professional involvement. However, advisroy committee requirements have rapidly proliferated as one condition for the approval of categorical grants. To cope with the growing profusion of advisory council requirements, Florida has specifically assigned an executive assistant to coordinate our federal advisory council activities. Just keeping track of the appointments requires close to fifteen percent of his time. Notwithstanding their value and function, advisory councils and committees are often redundant or ineffective because they operate in relative isolation from other important facets of their educational environment. Opportunities to blend or integrate programs into state or local ongoing programs are sometimes missed simply because advisory councils exhibit a limited perspective of the total educational system. Congress can and should assume the responsibility for monitoring the large number of advisory councils and committees which it authorizes, and review their effectiveness periodically. Although advisory councils perform an invaluable role in promoting parental participation, it is entirely possible to have "too much of a good thing." Congress must be reasonable in limiting the number of advisory councils to maintain the value and impact of their role within the educational system.

"Hold Harmless" and the Impact of Federal Involvement

The principle, intent, and equity of the "hold-harmless" concept should be reevaluated in light of the rapidly changing demands of a technological and mobile society. The equity of the hold-harmless concept must be measured in terms of the clients served. Ineligible participants due to changes in grant formulas should be phased-out through decreasing allocation floors. The concept of "hold-harmless" has serious implications for rapidly growing states such as Florida. When funding levels are held-harmless, states with eligible clients receive considerably lower "per-client" allotments than states without the necessary number of eligible clients. For example, congressional policy designed to aid disadvantaged children may suffer because funds are not allocated entirely on the basis of need, as demonstrated by the actual number of eligible clients for each state. The hold-harmless concept should be a factor to facilitate, not obstruct or delay, change in congressional intent.

It is difficult to minimize the impact and value of federal involvement. Nevertheless, from a state perspective the impact of federal authority has far exceeded their relative share of the total educational expenditures. Admittedly, Federal aid has prompted innovative programs in virtually every area of education despite limited funding. The federal government, and especially Congress, can and must continue to perform an important function for education, but equally important there must be a more equitable balance between the available funds and the regulatory authority imposed on state and local educational systems. The maintenance of existing educational programs is necessarily a state and local function. Therefore, federal programs must reflect the unique conditions of each state and locality, as well as continue to address national concerns and objectives and provide new avenues of educational development. Most importantly, federal regulation

should and must not supersede the authority legally vested to the states to administer and oeprate education programs.

National Educational Unity

Contemporary American politics are characterized by democratic pluralism in which various interest groups compete for power and money. Viewed from this perspective, the education community is but a single "interest group" among many. Yet, few educators and administrators actually perceive the relative priority of education in the federal budget. Unfortunately education is not a high federal priority as evidenced by annual appropriations.

A coalition of education "interests" rather than simply competing interest groups would be much more effective in achieving national, or even regional, goals and objectives. On some issues coalition may be difficult, if not impossible, to attain. Yet, where important issues such as funding or equality of educational opportunity are concerned a consensus can and must be maintained to achieve common goals. Where conflict exists, compromise and consensus must prevail. A coalition of educational interests must also work to implement compromise decisions. Coalition consensus and compromise are important building blocks for the continued growth and development of education.

Post-Secondary Education

Comprising public and private colleges and universities, community colleges, public vocational schools, and proprietary schools, the post-secondary education field is as diverse in composition as it is common in issues which cut across it; as frustrating in policy reform as it is exciting in conceiving new challenges; and as unfamiliar to the public-at-large as it is important to their cultural and economic well-being. Thus the post-secondary education field is characterized essentially by paradoxes.

But these paradoxes can be favorably resolved by the development of leadership and vision which concentrate on the future challenges in this complex field.

The major challenges can be summarized by the "three A's": access, adaptability, and authenticity.

Expanding access to post-secondary education institutuions has placed severe resource demands upon an already financially troubled system. As the impetus for giving even greater access to students in the post-secondary education system grows, and as resources for this system continue to become scarce, political, economic, and ethical issues will become more intense over open enrollment, educational demoncracy, and quality. In order to face these issues, post-secondary education leaders will have to focus on the challenge of adaptability. These leaders will have to look beyond their educational institutions in two ways in order to be successful. First, they have to look spatially beyond their institutions--to an understanding of the external political, economic, social, and cultural factors which are reshaping post-secondary education. Second, they have to look futuristically beyond their institutions to anticipate how these external factors will shape post-secondary education over the next fifty years.

Finally, the successful meeting of these first two challenges depends largely upon whether a third challenge is confronted--that of authenticity. In order to develop enlightened policies for the future of post-secondary education, the purpose of post-secondary institutions must be clarified, for there is presently a confusion of roles, a duplicating of function, and a blurring of scope within the post-secondary education enterprise. A lack of authenticity--in purpose, in role, and in scope--underlies many of the programmatic and budgetary problems which confront us today.

Post-Secondary Student Involvement

Students should be involved in educational decision-making, for they are the ultimate consumer of education. So many people forget that students

as clients of the educational system have the right to participate in decisions affecting educational policy-making and administration. Students are also a great and invaluable resource. Not only are they young, energetic, and creative, but they possess unique perspectives on education. As consumers and as human resources, students should and must be involved in appropriate ways in the decision-making processes.

GEORGIA

Jack P. Nix
State Superintendent of Schools

Georgia's public school system began 105 years ago. Since that time, it has grown from a system accommodating a few privileged individuals to a system established by constitutional provision mandating that all Georgians be provided an equal and adequate educational opportunity. In the last two decades, the States moved aggressively in consolidating schools and school systems to provide a more efficient management operation and to broaden the educational opportunities for all individuals, including those who have special needs. The State educational system is composed of 188 local school systems operating 1,846 schools. There are more than one million students enrolled in grades 1-12, with 94 secondary schools operating a substantial vocational component making them a comprehensive high school. In addition, 25,000 students are enrolled in early childhood education; 115,000 enrolled in 26 area vocational-technical schools; and 26,000 enrolled in basic adult education. More than 50,000 teachers, supervisors and school administrators are required to operate the system. The State educational agency operates one residential school for the deaf; one non-residential school for the deaf; one residential school for the blind; one residential school for the multi-handicapped; one center for youthful offenders; two residential

vocational-technical schools; and a network of eight educational television stations, with an elaborate production center. In FY 1976, the State school system will involve an expenditure of $658,671,754 in State funds, $143,017,893 in federal funds, and approximately $350,000,000 in local funds. The State Agency consists of 1,591 employees with a constitutional State Board of Education, appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate, with one member representing each congressional district, serving seven-year terms, and a constitutional State Superintendent of Schools, elected by the people for four-year terms, and for as many terms as he may be reelected.

The following are critical issues facing the Georgia public school system:

1. Education of young children, including day care, preschool, and kindergarten programs, and parent education for the parents of young children. Existing laws and policies on the local, state and federal levels tend to overlap, frustrating and confusing local school administrators in their efforts to provide complete services to young children. There are too many agencies involved, dissipating the meager financial resources available. There should be a consolidation of programs and funds to more adequately meet this responsibility.
2. Finance formulas and equality of educational opportunity tend to be distorted by special interest groups. The increasing educational costs and declining student population with a public mandate that more be accomplished with less requires a redistribution of wealth through a change in tax bases. Cost benefits of programs and more business-like management practices are needed at every level of government to reclaim sufficient support from the public to redirect

our financial resources in providing for more equality of educational opportunity. The future will necessitate a substantial improvement and explanation in the training of school administrators to function in a more highly sophisticated educational management system.

3. Evaluation of student achievement continues to be a difficult issue for educators. The educational establishment does not really know how to measure what it produces. Specific criteria are needed to evaluate student progress in terms of the student's ability to achieve. It is not enough for a student to be able to master questions on pencil-and-paper tests since this type achievement will not suffice in today's way of life. The student must be able to function as a member of our social order and particularly is this true as it relates to our economic system. Criterion-referenced tests could be used in evaluating the educational system, its programs and methods.

4. Preservice and inservice teacher preparation programs are inadequate. It is essential that the educational enterprise commit itself to the development of a competency-based certification procedure. An individual wishing to become a professional educator should demonstrate that he can perform the necessary skills and possesses sufficient knowledge to function at a reasonable level of expectancy. It is only reasonable that we bring up the issue of "a teacher cannot teach that which he does not know." For a solution to be found in this area of need will necessitate a much closer working relationship between schools, local school systems, state education agencies, colleges and universities. It will, of necessity, involve a continuous process of evaluation at every stage of development.

5. The governance of education continues to be debated at every level of government. The role of government on the federal, state and local levels, as well as involvement of parents, professional organizations, special interest groups, unions, etc. should be defined before there is a further deterioration of the educational system in this Nation.
6. Energy and environmental probelms reflecting on our international economics and world problems are an issue in which the educational enterprise must become involved if we are to solve our international problems. The economic, governmental and social systems of other nations are exceedingly important in our international relationships as we learn to live in a nuclear age, with the spread of nuclear weapons. On an intra-national basis, the concept of a "throw away" society creates environmental problems relating to a need for conservation of our resources and less exploitation of our non-polluting energy resources. Public education is falling short in this entire area of education for "the masses" and steps should be taken to fill this important educational vacuum.
7. The increasing number of non-productive, older people necessitates our seriously modifying the educational enterprise to accommodate this segment of our population. How do we retrain and utilize for second and third careers these experienced and skilled individuals? Is it not possible for them to participate in public service, even to the extent of increasing retirement ages? If an increase in retirement age is not the answer, then how do we deal with increased leisure time for retired employees and school children?

The above items are not only critical issues facing the public school system in Georgia, but they are issues to which solutions must be found

for the Nation. A redirection of our efforts could very well assist in resolving some of these issues. However, in my opinion, it is going to require leadership at every level of government that is willing to "stand up and be counted" for as well as against actions and activities that will result in a more adequate education for our entire population. It seems to me that solutions to the above problems will solve many of the less critical issues with which we are confronted.

IDAHO

Roy Truby
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

I believe the role of the state superintendent and the department of education is changing and must continue to change if we are to make an impact. We must continually ask:

Where do we want to go?
What do we want to do?
What do we want education to do for us?
What kind of help is needed by the chief state school officer and the department of education?

As we assess the role of the department of education in all of this, I would like to share these observations with you. The education enterprise consists of a partnership between state, federal and local governments. Social mobility has caused much of this. A state or local district can no longer claim exclusive rights to a temporary citizen. We are all in this business of education together, and must coordinate our efforts for the welfare of children and adults.

This partnership, however much it is needed, cannot be controlled by Washington if we are to make an impact on our respective states. In our state, about 10% of the total dollars for education come from the federal government, yet at times this is accompanied by 50% control. It often

seems as though the tail is wagging the dog.

State Leadership

State leadership is a continuing need in our state, as in other states. I am convinced that a strong state department of education in the position occupied in the federal-state-local partnership will benefit all parties. The state has a constitutional responsibility for the education of the citizens of the state, and I believe it is legal, logical and desirable to have strong leadership emerging from departments of education.

It must be acknowledged that historically, state departments have played a relatively passive role in most states. This is partially a result of the historical role of departments--that of statistic gatherers and regulators.

But all of this is changing now and we must, in truth, give much of the credit to Congress and the U.S. Office of Education. Through the administration of Title V, ESEA, states have improved their capabilities and services in planning, research and demonstration programs, dissemination, evaluation, staff development and consultative and technical services, and in many other areas. While the Office of Education deserves much credit for the growth of state agencies, it's somewhat analogous to the parent who nourishes a child and then is the last to realize when that child has grown into a healthy, strong adult who needs self-determination.

We must now take more responsibility for our own destiny. The late Wayne O. Reed, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Education, said, "I am convinced that strong state departments of education, equal to the demands of the strategic position they occupy in the federal-state-local partnership, are essential to the improvement of education and our best hope for progress."[1]

---

[1]A paper presented at the National School Boards Association Convention, Boston, Massachusetts, April 6, 1965

Having discussed briefly the role of state leadership, I would now like to touch on a few areas in which I believe we must extend our leadership role to meet some of our educational needs in Idaho.

Political Awareness

It was once thought that educators should stay out of politics. We now know that we cannot provide effective leadership in our state without stepping into the political arena. The state superintendent must maintain effective relationships with both the legislative and executive branches of government.

The state superintendent and the department staff must work to establish and maintain the credibility of the state agency. This requires year-round communications with the legislature and the public. We must continually keep our legislature informed, not just when money is needed. Our staff has been involved in a political awareness workshop at all levels of the organization. We have dealt with legislative, press and community relations. This is an ongoing effort, and it is important that we have the flexibility and time to deal effectively with political constituencies within the state.

Need for Information

All too often we have good ideas, but lack the pertinent facts to back up our best of intentions. Our methods are often ineffective and inadequate.

We cannot overstress the need for statistics related to education in the United States. We must continue to work for modern methods of preparing records, of educational accounting and data processing.

Research and Development

Our state department doesn't have the capabilities, and probably shouldn't have, for pure research activities. But we should be more involved

in applied research. The state agency should be studying and planning for the kinds of experiments, curriculum improvement projects and demonstrations which should be carried on in each state. Research activities of Title III, ESEA have been coordinated through state agencies, but now it appears that we may be taking a step backward if NIE continues to ignore state agencies by working directly with LEA's.

Regional Offices of Education

While each state has different experiences in working with the ten respective regional offices, we feel that the Region X Office has developed a quickening tempo to needs in Idaho. This is partially because of the excellent staff, but even more important is the philosophy that the regional office is there to assist the states. We feel we have an ombudsman (or ombudsperson--how's that for a word!) who is willing to go to bat for us. We believe that we need service and assistance more than we need another intermediate bureaucracy making administrative decisions for Idaho.

School Finance Studies

The Idaho Supreme Court, in May of 1975, overruled the District Court which had previously held that Idaho's system of financing schools was unconstitutional. Even though the highest court has held by a narrow margin (3-2) that our financing system is constitutional, we still have the problems with us.

The U.S. Office of Education cannot be expected to alter state financing systems for us, but this is an area where the Office of Education can provide leadership. As we try to develop a plan for a more fair and equitable system that we can sell to our legislature, we would like to call on the Office of Education for information and technical assistance. We need current information about school finance reforms in each state, and the Office of Education could serve as a logical clearinghouse for information and

technical assistance.

Summary

State departments of education must emerge as the leaders in the federal-state-local partnership for the improvement of education. Theirs is a constitutional responsibility which must be met. No longer can the state agency be passive and content as a regulatory agency, but instead must be sensitive to the political climate and maintain a viable position of educational leadership. The U.S. Office of Education with its regional offices should take the initiative to provide those services which are impractical for the states to provide, such as in-depth studies on problems applicable to any state, research activities, etc. The days of "staying off the firing line so you won't get shot" are gone for the state departments of education.

ILLINOIS

Joseph M. Cronin
State Superintendent of Education

From the Chicago metropolis to the small rural communities of the south, Illinois reflects enormous diversity. As of 1973, 11,236,000 people lived here sending over 2.3 million children to school in one of 1,031 public school districts. Illinois ranks fifth among the states in population, sixth in per capita income and spends approximately $2.885 billion dollars for public education.

Illinois, like other states, is faced with many challenges--declining enrollment, unequal levels of educational quality, represented by widely varying expenditures, simultaneous shortages and surpluses of teachers in many fields, adult illiteracy, non-compliance with mandatory programs, violation in health and safety codes, school district consolidation, desegregation. . . . And Illinois, as elsewhere, with a new State Board of Education intends to try to meet these challenges.

In FY-76, the State of Illinois will provide approximately 45% of the dollars needed to run local school districts. A "resource equalizer" formula assumes that every district has the tax base to aupport a minimum level of $1,260 per student--or the state makes up the difference. But here, as elsewhere, land is not equal--all land does not have costly governmental facilities located on it; some is only red clay. Consequently one unit district, Brookport, has only $3,032 assessed valuation per pupil while, Monticello, has $108,256 assessed valuation working for each pupil. While the amount of local or state money behind each pupil does not insure quality education, it cannot hurt.

What are the prospects--the solutions? The legislature can try to raise the level of state support. But, during a recession and drop in revenue this is not too easy, as Illinois found out several weeks ago during budget time. Almost as urgent a need is district consolidation--reorganization.

Illinois has 1,031 school districts--elementary districts, high school districts, and unit districts. One district has one building and houses 66 pupils while another, Chicago, has well over 500,000 students. The poorest district in the state, Brookport, is 20 miles from one of the richest. Community support is needed to make these changes and efforts are being directed toward getting the citizens concerned about the inequities right in their own backyards.

Illinois is faced also with the problem of declining enrollments. In the next ten years, it is estimated that a decline of 300,000 students will take place. While some suburban districts around Chicago are increasing, many other school buildings will have to close. In fact, one district very near Chicago will lose 50% of its entire school-age population. Districts will be closing schools, some built as late as 1950.

But I see this problem as one that could be very helpful in alleviating

others. Illinois has more than four million adults who lack high school diplomas or the equivalent and 200,000 functional illiterates. Illinois has 46,000 dropouts who leave the system and many adults who seek basic, supplementary, and preparatory education through the local schools and community colleges. School buildings empty in ten years can be filled in with the people who pay for them--the taxpayers. Adult education is certainly one solution to the declining enrollment problem.

There are several other areas where Illinois might also redirect efforts--where work in one area can relieve several other problem areas.

Teacher supply and demand is an issue that Illinois must face. We have too many teachers in many areas and a scarcity in others. Illinois has thousands of teachers of the liberal arts looking for work while schools beg for health education teachers and special education teachers. For too long colleges have emphasized the liberal arts while slighting the practical arts.

Illinois needs 1,000 more bilingual and bicultural education teachers and people with majors in health education who can deal with drug abuse, alcoholism, and venereal disease. Illinois needs more special education teachers to comply with the Illinois law that mandates special education services for handicapped children from ages 3-21. Vocational education teachers are needed and many more teachers trained in adult or pre-school education. Illinois will need specialists to teach metric education, data processing, media, and individualization.

Too many teachers? Lowering the retirement age and the shutting down of very small teacher preparation programs are methods proposed along with a 50% reduction in the number of students entering teacher training. The solution is in retraining those who do want to, can be, and are already good teachers. The

potential students are there. Long-range planning is needed in teacher preparation and training teachers for 1985 and 1990 as well as for today.

We are working to solve many of the inequities in our school system. We are working on the "mainstreaming" of special education students into the school world of the non-handicapped. We are trying to find more dollars to train teachers to teach bilingual students. (Twenty-nine languages are spoken in Illinois.) We are working in vocational education and creating alternative education programs for students who can't or won't make it in the regular school program.

Equal educational opportunity for our children is a top priority goal. Of the 2.4 million students in Illinois, 431,054 are black and 92,469 Spanish surnamed. The ten largest school districts in the state account for 422,867 or 80.8% of this total population in the state. Chicago alone has 375,000 black- or Spanish-surnamed students in the school district.

More than 25 local school districts have desegregated since 1965 but the larger cities still present serious challenges. A dozen school districts, due to shifts in housing patterns, have actually increased segregation between 1971-1975.

In addition to seeking an amicus curiae status in several desegregation suits in federal court the State Officer offers technical assistance in program development, materials selection, human development training. The Equal Educational Opportunity Section of the office has even paid for computer-assisted assignment of students, and we have been working with the local school districts and Washington to secure Title VII funds.

Yet another area of discrimination needs to be seriously looked at nationally, as well as in Illinois; and that, of course, is sex discrimination--sex discrimination in program offerings, sex discrimination in program content,

sex discrimination in the hiring of school personnel.

The new Title IX regulations will do much to assist us in this area but I expect resistance to the federal law. We are going to have to deal with people who say "Fine, we'll set up a girls' tennis team; we'll even let them be on the once 'all boys'team'--but who is going to give us the money to make everything equal?" I believe we will be needing some very strong support from Washington in this area.

In Illinois 62% of the elementary school teachers are women but fewer than 8% of the superintendents are. Although almost one-half of the nation's 88 women school superintendents are in Illinois, most are elementary school superintendents and many are nearing retirement age. Can we open courses and opportunities to girls and yet administer them by men? I think not. This is an area, the development and training of more women administrators, where we need more state and federal assistance. We can develop affirmative action and clean up our own houses, the state offices of education, but we will need a little more federal clout when we try to move from the talking stages into the actual training and placing of minority administrators.

Most of the critical issues that face Illinois are under consideration by the State Board of Education, the first in the state's history.

Soon after taking office the State Board attended a workshop and got down to the business of identifying goals and priorities. Many I have mentioned above, but I will list them for you here--as they may well be priorities we ought to consider at <u>this</u> workshop.

FIRST--<u>Quality integrated education for all children</u>--What are we doing to insure that every child has equal access to the best schools, materials, and equipment--and the opportunity to learn about or study with students of different and varied backgrounds?

SECOND--Teacher certification and preparation--What are we doing to train and re-train teachers? Do our teachers really want to teach? Do they want to and can they relate to students? Can we find a way to help us determine this?

THIRD--Vocational education--Commissioner Bell has said that our goal should be "that every young person completing our school program at Grade 12 should be ready to enter higher education or enter useful and rewarding employment." Vocational education cooperatives are forming in Illinois and offering programs that will help us train entry level workers. But EPDA funds can only go so far. Can we look to the federal government for more money without state-matching efforts?

FOURTH--Finance--How can we insure the adequate financing of school districts? Changes in the Title I formula like the last one made are devastating to urban industrial states like Illinois.

FIFTH--Improving reading and literacy--Illinois has gone a long way in securing community involvement in our Right-to-Read program--but with 200,000 illiterates, we obviously have a long way to go.

SIXTH--The desegregation of all school districts in the state--Our State Board wanted to be quite clear that they want steps taken to achieve the first priority--quality integrated education by eliminating all traces of segregation.

SEVENTH--A simplified reporting system between the Illinois Office of Education and local school districts--The new federal consolidations, while also giving the states more discretion in awarding funds, also help to ease the paperwork problem. How good it is to consolidate advisory councils and state plans. We want to try to do this on a state level and in the process cut our 850 forms to a minimum.

EIGHTH--A way to evaluate the work of the Board and the Superintendent--Are we effective and accountable?

NINTH--Bilingual and bicultural education--We are working on getting more

money and also to refine the certification laws to allow South American "normalista" students to teach.

TENTH--Better and coordinated service to local school districts.

The Board has also listed other goals and priorities. They will be studying the role of the office in the evaluation of schools. Each year 265 schools are visited to determine if they meet criteria set out in the Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision and Recognition of Schools. Criteria for school governance, administration, instruction, and support services and programs, life safety codes--will all be evaluated and quite possibly tightened up.

Additionally, Illinois will review the functions of communication and information dissemination, dropout and truancy prevention, student rights and responsibility and goals development.

Illinois will try to squeeze every penny's worth of value from our education dollar. And, we are trying to find more dollars. Hopefully, the economic indicators that show an upswing will be reflected in our state and local sales taxes and next year we will be able to increase the level of state funding, at least enough to keep up with inflation.

Illinois will be agressively seeking a greater and fairer share of federal education dollars for our state. In 1973-74 Illinois received 6.1 per cent of our school revenue from the federal government compared with a national average of 8.2.

Illinois deserves credit for past efforts. Many, many exciting things are happening here. One of the best special education bills in the country is on the books in Illinois and we are making great strides toward full implementation. We have 110,000 teachers, the vast majority dedicated and doing a find job. We have schools with superior media programs and resources

quite unlike any I have seen elsewhere. We have successfully integrated many school districts. We are self-conscious about the unmet needs, maybe more than most states.

But we need to find more money, we need to look at redefinition--redirection. All the states do. And, this is why Illinois and the federal government must work on education issues together.

INDIANA

Harold H. Negley
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

In this short paper an attempt is made to comply with the USOE request that critical issues be identified within the writer's state and perhaps within the nation as well. As a variation of this matter there has been set forth an abstract of educational matters at the elementary-secondary level as they apply to the USOE and to our Department. It may be inferred that the men and women of the Indiana Department of Public Instruction have discussed these and related matters widely. The matters under consideration do apply partially to the USOE and probably to some of the other state education agencies.

As a conceptual framework there is a general statement concerning changing conditions and then the topics related are refined from there.

The changes around us are occurring at uneven paces with varying intensities and with a wide range in their completeness. Most of these changes are activated by groups of people demanding greater opportunity for themselves or others but within frameworks of action in which the changes are partially under their control. For example, most class suits today emanate from planned attacks in which a number of possible suits are examined and only a few selected.

One strong by-product of the pathways now utilized for change is that we are becoming a very law-oriented society and though law is much utilized as a determiner of societal change, this does not seem to be one of the law-abiding, acquiescing epochs in our national history. A law-evoked change may be accepted with minimal dissention in one sector of our population but resisted fiercely in others. We see these differences in acceptance occurring whenever added services are authorized for distinctive groups (such as migrant youth) or when changes in status are legislated (as with women).

A pertinent result of differentiated change is to fog up any systematic and orderly way of achieving desirable goals whether in educating youth or in setting an energy policy. There is much ado but much of the ado is for the sake of ado. Office seekers and office holders often talk on equality in education generally or upon the need for greater opportunity for groups of young people who have less opportunity than the majority. And in doing so, the effect may be good--to keep attention on a problem; or it may be bad--to advocate unfruitful actions.

In the midst of this disorganized thought and feeling the imperatives for the USOE and for leaders such as Chief State School Officers involve clarification of the <u>means</u> to acknowledged ends and of implementation of

means to these ends through clearly focused but coordinated plans of instructional action.

There already seem to be some programs having suggested goals worth developing and emphasizing. These include early childhood, the reading program, career education, vocational education, and international education. In addition, an emphasis upon science education (including metrication), environmental education plus the cultural arts needs to be mounted and sustained.

These are the instructional areas of concern. To whom do they apply and how?

The education needs of Indians, Spanish-speaking, Blacks and the handicapped do not lie outside of these learning areas but have a variety of differences in their application. In a general way what is needed is greater coordination in attacking the common educational needs of diverse groups.

All of this is at odds with some of the philosophic premises now apparent in the Congress, reflected in the USOE and probably in some SEA's. What may be called "cafeteria efforts" have characterized at least Title III, certain Commissioner's Grants and a part of ABE. Under existing statutes and existing implementation it seems almost impossible to mount a concerted attack upon illiteracy. There is less than optimal action possible in coordinating Pupil Personnel efforts, for example, with those of Title I. (Thus, attention to the absenteeism which hampers skill development in urban areas seems currently better related to the Migrant Education program than to the much larger Title I program.)

In essence, the chief efforts to be put forth by both the USOE and this Chief State School Officer seem to be the following:

1. Keeping focus upon a set of priorities and acting to implement them as well as possible.
2. Coordinating programs that are widely sought by minority groups (such as improved literacy and vocational programs).
3. Keeping attention upon the conditions that permit successful school performance. Some of these involve control mechanisms (which we try to effect through a Crisis Division) and some involve extended service activities (e.g., Early Childhood).
4. Providing a vista for intercultural awareness within and across national boundaries.

When these desired efforts are related only to Indiana's SEA, annoying and recurring problems emerge which may be loosely categorized as (a) diversionary, (b) roadblocking, or (c) lacking in energetic support.

Diversionary problems may be exemplified by any of the following:

--interagency squabbling over jurisdictions

--substandard buildings and programs in rural areas

--federal and state audits far after the fact

--pressure group attacks on materials or programs.

Roadblocking problems include:

--legislative opposition to a variety of financial reforms in public education

--state budget agency restrictions upon SEA personnel practices

--legislative opposition to intermediate districts and to reorganized districts

--locality opposition to orderly vocational planning.

Problems of a lack of support include:

--lack of support for mandatory kindergarten offerings

--lack of financial support for vocational schools

--lack of support for pre-kindergarten funding

--lack of general interest in international education.

It does not seem productive to set forth every governmental and societal problem which has an impact upon our educational system or for which educators are asked to provide help. That kind of diffusion draws attention from the solvable problems facing educators everywhere. The people in the USOE and those of us who are Chief State School Officers, both know how to do more than we do well. We should continue to strive to keep a focus and an impact upon the problems the nation has not solved but could if there were enough will to do so.

IOWA

Robert D. Benton
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

There are literally hundreds of "critical problems and issues" that one could identify when surveying the entire educational enterprise in Iowa. Obviously the degree of severity of these problems and issues varies markedly. In addition, the impact that a problem has on any given group varies considerably. What may be a very serious problem or issue to one segment of the population, may have minor impact on another group. Be that as it may, the writer considers the following to be the "critical problems and issues in education" in Iowa:

1. School finance.
2. Early childhood education
3. Implementing complete programming for the handicapped.
4. Various federal mandates and practices in educational programming.

It should be understood that these four "problems and issues" are not listed in any rank of importance. In the sections that follow, each problem or issue will be treated thusly: a statement of the problem; a discussion of the background of the problem and its implications for and affects on education in Iowa; and a relating of the problem to the federal situation, both present and in the future.

I. School Finance

The problem.--The financing of public elementary and secondary education in Iowa is based almost exclusively on a formula approach. A school district's operating budget is determined by a formula contained in state law, and no discretion is given to local boards of education to vary from that formula. Only the School Budget Review Committee (a state body) or a vote of the people to impose an income surtax can authorize a school district to exceed the "formula" budget. This has created a situation whereby local districts have found it very difficult to respond in a reasonable manner to inflation, changing enrollment patterns (particularly declining enrollments), employee bargaining, and program improvement and/or growth.

Background, implications and affects.--"A property tax revolt" is the term used by many observers to explain the drastic action taken by the legislature in 1971 to reverse almost total autonomy for local school districts in financial matters to complete budgetary limit control by the state via the foundation aid formula. This "revolt" was triggered by the dramatic rise in property taxes for the support of education that occurred in the three-year period--1968-71. During that time property taxes increased a dramatic 31.4% or an average of $138 per student statewide. Projections by tax experts indicated that that rate would continue and probably accelerate

if something wasn't done to achieve a different "mix" of revenue sources and place some type of a limit on expenditures. (Note: In 1970-71, the "mix" of revenue for support of local school districts was as follows: local property taxes, 66.1%; state aid, 27.0%; and miscellaneous income, 6.9%.)

Without getting into extensive detail, the Iowa school foundation aid plan operates thusly:

1. A state cost per pupil is determined as a base cost for each district's controlled budget.
2. To fund the local budget, a district must levy 20 mills of property tax and the state will provide the difference between the amount raised by the 20-mill levy and 70% of the state cost per pupil. The district must levy an additional property tax to finance the remainder of the controlled budget. This foundation level of 70% increases 1% per year until a foundation level of 80% is reached (1982).
3. Following the base year, each school district has been able to increase its expenditures annually based on an annual allowable growth. This allowable growth was to be computed using a three-year average of the growth in state general fund revenues and statewide assessed valuation of taxable property. This produced an Iowa economic growth factor similar to the national consumer price index. This allowable growth percentage was taken times the state cost per pupil to determine the increase per pupil allowed for local school districts. (Example: State per pupil cost $920 x 5% allowable growth = $46.00.)
4. Finally, a school budget review committee was established whose function was to hold hearings for school districts who wished to be

granted permission to exceed their controlled budget level of expenditures.

The basic implications and affects are these:

1. It has achieved a new mix of revenue. During the 1974-75 school year, state aid exceeded the 50% mark, and local property taxes have decreased appreciably.
2. The disparity among local school district per pupil costs has decreased considerably.
3. A school district's enrollment takes on added significance under Iowa's school foundation plan. It determines a district's budget; and declining enrollments, so prevalent currently, have created problems for many school districts.
4. The method of preparing budgets has completely changed. Instead of determining needs, developing an educational plan and then making financial decisions in light of those education plans, the reverse is now true.
5. Having only so many dollars presents many priority-setting dilemmas. One is the difficulty in developing new programs under this situation. If a new need is identified, something else "has to go" if it is to be implemented. This isn't always bad, but low-spending districts find it extremely difficult to fill voids in their programming.
6. A second dilemma brought about by "limited dollars" concerns collective bargaining by public school employers. Iowa's public employee collective bargaining law, which is considered one of the most comprehensive in the nation, becomes fully operational July 1, 1975. Normally, employees bargain for "new" money. In

the private sector, employees usually raise that "new" money by either increasing the price of the product or effecting additional production efficiencies. In either case, "new" dollars are raised. With controlled budgeting, there is no way to "raise new dollars." Thus, employees must bargain for a bigger percentage of those dollars.

Federal implications.--The propensity of the federal government to identify a new thrust in education; provide "seed money" to launch that thrust; and, then, expect local school districts to continue funding those programs when federal monies are withdrawn presents the greatest problem. Granted, this is a generalization, but a number of examples of this could be cited to document the point.

The most current example is the discussion currently going on in the Congress concerning new directions in vocational education funding at the federal level. There seems to be some concern that such a large percentage of federal vocational funds is being used to "maintain" ongoing programs. A number of congressmen and senators seem to be stressing the "seed" money concept. Many Iowa school districts are seriously considering not accepting dollars (federal or state) that may be withdrawn in the future because of the difficulty of finding replacement dollars within their controlled budgets.

In summary, then, the "critical problem or issue" of school finance in Iowa is that school districts must operate within formula-determined budgets. This produces just so many dollars. If the federal government wishes to become a partner in providing educational services to students in the various states, it is the opinion of the writer that it must be willing to become a full partner, not one that is "in and out."

This opinion doesn't preclude the necessity of constantly evaluating programs and making qualitative judgments, but there are a number of programs where the "seed money" concept just isn't practical. Vocational education programs and programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped, in the opinion of the writer, are two such examples.

II. Early Childhood Education

The problem.--A recently passed state law prohibits the counting of prekindergarten children in a school district's enrollment, thus making it impossible to fund early childhood education programs through the state school foundation aid formula. The funding of prekindergarten programs for handicapped children, which is provided for under separate state statutes, was excluded from this prohibition. In addition, a law was passed which mandated a licensing procedure for child care centers to be administered by the Department of Social Services. Finally, a statewide task force appointed by the Governor to make recommendations concerning a comprehensive state plan for early childhood programming seems to be leaning in the direction of proposing an early childhood department.

Background, implications and affects.--During the 1974-75 school year, approximately 300 preschool-age handicapped children were enrolled in approved programs in Iowa's public school districts.

Also, a number of private nursery school programs were operating in Iowa. Ironically, these programs, if they wished official approval, had to be licensed by the State Department of Health, not the Department of Public Instruction.

In the meantime, many unfavorable practices of day care centers started to receive public notice. Considerable interest in mandatory

licensing of day care centers developed. Such legislation did pass this last session.

As one can readily see, this "hodge podge" of early childhood educational endeavors was literally "crying for resolution." The Governor's task force, mentioned earlier, was the result.

Although the writer has not been personally involved to any degree in the deliberations of this task force, Departmental staff people have been active members. They report little real progress toward solving the multitudinous problems and aspects of this situation. As mentioned in "The problem" section above, it would appear that the "turfmanship" activities of the various segments may result in all of them being excluded, and a new State Department of Child Care may be formed.

Now, what are the implications and affects of all this activity? First, regular prekindergarten programming, although not outlawed per se, has been statutorily excluded from enrollment counts for budgetary purposes.

Second, the inability of the various groups interested in early childhood programs to resolve their differences is a serious matter. There is much expertise to be found in all groups, and it would be a shame if a new department were formed. It always takes time for a new agency to "get off the ground." In the meantime, the needs of preschool age children would go unmet, at least from an organized and well-planned standpoint.

Federal implications.--The problem, implications and affects of the early childhood scene in Iowa as described above is, in the opinion of the writer, just a microcosm of the situation on the national level. The same activities have been observed in operation with

federal agencies.

Should early childhood programming be the domain of the educational enterprise?

Should early childhood programming be the domain of welfare agencies?

Should early childhood programming be the domain of health groups? Or, should early childhood programming be the domain of none of these three, but come into its own by the development of a new and separate agency? These are the pertinent questions that need thorough study. It would seem that the federal agency that has all three of these components included in its name--the Department of Health, Education and Welfare--could adequately address this problem and come up with some suitable answers.

III. Implementing Complete Programming for the Handicapped.

The problem.--During the 1974 session of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly, Senate File 1163 was passed. Basically, this piece of legislation mandated that every child shall be provided a suitable educational program, regardless of his or her physical or mental condition, and a system of financing that programming was developed. In the case of handicapped youngsters, that programming could be provided from birth to age twenty-one. Prior to this legislative enactment, special educational programming, although mandated at all levels, was being offered to only an estimated twenty to thirty per cent of those needing it. In addition, certain exclusionary provisions contained in other parts of school law had literally eliminated any significant programming for the profoundly or severely handicapped. The "gut" issue--how does a state move from meeting only about twenty to thirty per cent of the needs of the handicapped to one hundred per cent commitment of providing a "suitable" program to all youngsters?

Background, implications and affects.--This legislation was developed and enthusiastically supported by the Department which the writer heads. It was one of the "essential needs" of the State Board of Public Instruction discussed earlier in this paper, so the difficulty of implementing the program is the only aspect that makes it a problem.

Special education programming had been mandated at all levels by 1970, but fulfillment of the mandate was less than complete. This was caused by lack of staff at the state level to adequately monitor the mandate; inadequate state appropriation to fully reimburse the "excess costs," thus shifting heavy financial burdens on local school district budgets; and the lack of a total commitment on the part of professional educators and the lay public to meeting the educational needs of all people.

In 1974, after years of development and promotion by the Department personnel and other interested parties, Senate File 1163 was passed, and Iowa became one of the few states pledged to a one hundred per cent commitment to fulfilling all of the educational needs of its handicapped children under the age of 21, including those who might be classified as "profoundly or severely handicapped."

The legislation contains the following definition: " 'Children requiring special education' means persons under 21 years of age, including children under 5 years of age, who are handicapped in obtaining an education because of physical, mental, emotional, communication or learning disabilities or who are chronically disruptive."

The implications and affects that have developed during this planning and transition year have been interesting, to say the least.

First, the financial implications have just begun to surface. Even though legislators were warned that costs would be significantly greater, the degree of increase was not anticipated. It was estimated that the state's 1974-75 commitment of approximately $12 million would double to $25 million in 1975-76, and ultimately go to about $50 million. In actuality, the 1975-76 commitment is projected to be about $40 million and the "leveling off" figure is now estimated to be about $75 million. In fact, in order to limit expenditures to the $40 million figure, the Department had to "hold the line" on special education support services budgets of the area education agencies to a statewide average of $40 per student instead of the proposed $56. A five-year phase-in plan was inaugurated by the Department to "soften the blow," even though the law does mandate immediate fulfillment.

This disparity in expenditure projections was caused by inadequate needs data. Because of inadequate funding, a huge backlog of identified students not being served had developed. Thus, when a means for funding programs became available, this backlog was immediately "ready" for services.

Second, the staffing implications of moving from meeting twenty to thirty percent of special education needs to a one hundred percent commitment are enormous. The ending of the overall teacher shortage has not occurred in special education. Qualified personnel have always been at a premium, and such an increase in demand could be horrendous.

Surprisingly enough, this situation has not been as serious as anticipated. Even though some positions are still vacant, larger numbers of qualified personnel have been employed than anticipated.

Finally, the expectation levels of parents of handicapped youngsters has created some interesting implications and affects. Naturally, the

general feeling of parents has been one of "at last, our needs are being recognized and dealt with." This feeling of exhilaration has sometimes turned to frustration and anger, though, when the hard realities of not being able to implement this one hundred percent mandate immediately have become apparent. This "expectation" problem is a very serious one and can create a severe credibility gap.

Federal implications.--Normally, this type of problem would not have serious federal implications. Implementing complete programming for the handicapped is basically a state function and federal involvement should be minimal. Not so, in this case. The Congress unexpectedly decided to consider rather sweeping changes in federal legislation dealing with funding for programs for the handicapped.

The details of this proposed legislation will not be discussed in this paper because the provisions seem to change almost from day to day. Rather, one general provision that seems to be receiving considerable support will be pinpointed. That provision concerns the supplanting issue. Section 614 of the May 21, 1975 draft of H.R. 7217 contains the following provision:

> "Federal Funds" expended for programs under this part shall be used to pay only the excess costs directly attributable to the education of handicapped children, and shall also provide satisfactory assurance that such funds shall be used to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of State, local, and private funds expended for the education of handicapped children, and in no case to supplant such State, local, and private funds...

This provision would create difficulty in Iowa because of the special education mandate for the handicapped from age 0 to 21, with the statutory provisions to generate the necessary funds. There would be difficulty in fully utilizing these federal funds in Iowa without

supplanting to some degree the responsibilities that are contained in the Iowa statutes.

Since that May 21st draft, some amendments have been adopted that supposedly alleviate that problem. The exact wording is unimportant, but the concept is crucial. States that have assumed the responsibility of meeting the educational needs of their handicapped and that have adopted a complete funding plan to finance those programs should not be penalized by being denied federal funds. If a state has made and is fulfilling that type of commitment, in the opinion of the writer, it should be allowed, indeed encouraged, to use those federal funds to supplant local and state funds. As pointed out earlier, the costs of implementing a one hundred percent commitment are enormous. Why should states that aren't making that commitment be rewarded for their neglect?

IV. Various Federal Mandates and Practices in Educational Programming

Federal "mandates" and "practices" are more "concerns" than "critical problems and issues." Also, their origin comes from outside the state rather than emanating from within.

1. Statutory advisory committees.--Increasingly, Congress and/or the USOE are mandating that fully or semi-autonomous advisory committees be appointed to "advise" the duly designated state agency in the implementation and administration of federal programs. A number of problems have arisen from this practice.

   First, these advisory committees are sometimes appointed by some one other than the agency to be "advised," i.e., the Vocational Advisory Committee is appointed by the Goverror. This often results in "political" appointements rather than "expertise" being the main criterion.

Second, these committees almost become a dual state agency. This would have been the case if the state Vocational Advisory Committees had been granted the policy-making authority that was being proposed in the early drafts of the vocational education amendments. Also, early drafts of the federal handicapped education legislation contained provisions for the state advisory committee to be charged with strong monitoring responsibilities.

Finally, the mandatory advisory committee mania can create problems at the local level. The recent changes in ESEA Title I that mandate building level advisory committees is an example. "Too many cooks spoil the broth" seems to be applicable in this instance.

The distinction between the advisory and policy-making functions needs to be maintained. Also, it is the writer's belief that the decision to have or not to have advisory committees is by-and-large best left to the agency concerned. Mandating such advisory committees often leads to either attempted usurpation of the policy-making function or an act of tokenism in involvement.

2. Mandatory "set asides" in categorical aids.--This practice is best illustrated in the allocating of vocational educational and ESEA Title III funds. The former act provides for "set asides" of 10% and 15% for vocational programming for the handicapped and disadvantaged, respectively. The latter has a 15% "set aside" for handicapped programming. When one considers that massive separate programs are available for both of these categories, this "set aside" practice tends to "stack

program upon program." For example, it would seem more reasonable to mandate that a portion of ESEA Title I (programming for disadvantaged) be allocated to vocational programs, if that is deemed desirable, than the present practice of reserving vocational funds for the disadvantaged. This may seem like a "which comes first, the chicken or the egg" argument, but these types of mandates seem "a bit mu[illegible] "

3. Dual authorization of programs.--Closely related to the "set aside" issue discussed above, is the problem of dual authorization of programs. The prime example of this concerns the "authorization" provisions for career education in P. L. 93-380 and the "authorization" for career education in the proposed vocational education amendments. The solution to this problem seems to be obvious. A designation decision should be made, and then all authorizing legislation should be channeled to the "designated" portion of federal law.

4. Data gathering and reporting demands.--Volumes have been written on this topic. Millions of man hours (and, no doubt, millions of dollars) have been expended in trying to deal with this issue. The Committee on Evaluation and Information Systems (CEIS) of the Council of Chief State School Officers has been operational for at least four years. Its main function has been to counsel with USOE on this issue. Only one point will be stressed. Usually, the USOE asks that state education agencies coordinate data gathering activities in the respective states. Each request usually requires a slightly different data base. It would be highly desirable to finally achieve the goals

of the "Common Core of Data" proposals of several years ago. This has not been done. It is a worthy goal, in the opinion of the writer.

V. Conclusion

As indicated earlier, a number of other "critical problems and issues in education in Iowa" could be identified and discussed at some length. The three main "problems and issues" originating at the state level and the fourth general topic of "federal concerns" appear to the writer to be the most crucial. It is hoped that the discussion contained herein will provide "grist" for meaningful discussion at the 1975 Institute for Chief State School Officers.

KENTUCKY

Lyman V. Ginger
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

INTRODUCTION

Some of these issues relate to elementary and secondary education, some relate to vocational education, but all of them will be limited to the general area usually administered by state departments of education. It is recognized that some departments have a very definite responsibility for higher education. Higher education in this paper will not be mentioned. It is also recognized that vocational education is not the responsibility of some departments of education and in those states this will not be a question or topic that will relate to them.

GOVERNANCE

The first general topic that I would like to present is that of governance of American education. Who should govern, manage, regulate and operate American elementary, secondary and vocational education? This is

one of the very pressing problems confronting American education. Some of the illustrations that will be given indicate why this is a concern.

The federal court has had a very definite bearing on American education. The decisions of the federal courts, and for that matter, other courts, have influenced to a great degree not only what will be taught but how the schools in general will be managed. This has to do with the decisions on open records, equal opportunities, busing, and a host of other topics that have been handled in the past by the courts. The question is, how much influence should the courts have? And, is the court the proper place to manage and control education?

It is recognized that federal guidelines must be determined, must be written, must be planned, and that programs must be implemented with the wishes of the federal government and the desires of Congress, and it is understood that members of the U.S. Office of Education possess the capacity and the ability to write and develop guidelines that are practical and workable. However, there is not a Chief State School Officer in the nation who has not had a very complicated and difficult time in administering some of the guidelines, and of knowing, understanding and interpreting what the guidelines mean.

Title I is a case in point. If state departments, as well as superintendents and administrators of the public schools of this nation had had a more direct and important voice in shaping these guidelines and regulations, a different set would have been developed.

All of us have suffered at the hands of the auditor; where the auditors have one view of what the guidelines say, the state departments have another view of what they say, and the U.S. Office of Education still another. What should there be such a great variety of policies and plans for administering programs?

Title IV is a new program; and even though the federal legislation was enacted more than two years ago, the guidelines have only been recently developed. There exists many misunderstandings between the state and the U.S. Office relative to the interpretation of the guidelines and whether they actually carry out the intent of the law. Opinions differ greatly and the interpretation of the guidelines from the U.S. Office and from the state level, in many cases, is quite different. This illustration is being used only for the purpose of suggesting that problems do exist even with new programs and that questions are raised relative to the practicality of some of the rules and regulations already being required of state departments of education.

The basic question is, what can be done to bring about a better working relationship so that states will have a better understanding of how some uniformity can be developed in providing for the development and interpretation of guidelines?

It has been stated that while the federal government provides only some 6 or 7 percent of the money, it exerts some 30 to 40 percent of the control at almost every level in state departments of education. While the exact amount of control is not known, certainly as far as percentages are concerned, it is a fact that the guidelines which regulate federal programs constitute a very small part of the total operation. When catagorical aid is the general purpose of the legislation, the impact on the rest of the program in the entire school system cannot be considered to be minor in nature.

The governance which has grown out of the busing situation is one that in many, many sections of the nation is of more than little concern and interest. No one can say that these court decisions have not had a massive effect on curriculum, instruction, methods, procedures, and

finally, outcomes of the program.

There are many other governance areas which could be mentioned: the impact of ADD's districts, governing boards, The Education Commission of the States. What we are concerned with and considering now is governance as a general issue. It is understandable that all the factors from the outside that impinge on local control, on state boards and local boards of education, on state superintendents and local superintendents, all of these are at times very frustrating and very difficult to reconcile with the general, overall purposes of education.

Another area that is of extreme importance is that of the relationship of the superintendent of schools, the principal of a school, the school board to the teacher.

Teachers contend--with opposition from most school administrators, although not all, and from most school boards, not all--that collective bargaining is a solution to the problem. The controversy rages, and across the nation threats and counter-threats are made repeatedly. The National Education Association contends that it can, will and does elect national, state and local officials, and will defeat others if they oppose collective bargaining.

The purpose again of this writer is not to solve the problem, but to point out that in the governance of the schools, the collective bargaining issue is a "hot one" and one that has been advocated repeatedly by school teachers, denied by school boards and rejected by most school administrators. It can be pointed out that collective bargaining is working effectively in many places. It can also be pointed out that collective bargaining has led to a heavy expenditure of money in many places and is leading in some cases, according to local administrators, to bankruptcy or near bankruptcy, when all of the desires of the teachers are granted. The issue is,

what is the role of collective bargaining in the scheme of things in operating the schools, and how shall this be handled?

FINANCING EDUCATION

A problem that has existed since the beginning of American public education has been that of who shall finance education, how much financial support is needed, the source of the money, and how it will be spent. Better working relationships and a better partnership should be developed between the different levels of support.

Local support could very well moving out of the picture as far as one of the important sources of revenue. If we are to consider equalizing educational opportunity, is it not time to talk about a state program of financing education in partnership with the federal program of education?

The mobility of our people, the ease with which they move from one area to another, job opportunities which move people across the nation, different kinds of preparation programs for skills and education needed, leads me to suggest that federal support should have a more prominent part to play. It also appears that if local control is to continue to be a point of importance that some means should be developed to provide for state support, less local support, but retain the local control. This is a very complicating factor, but it is an issue which is bedeviling every local system in every state in the nation.

The question of finance is very important. Should support be catagorical at the federal level or should it be general at the federal level? Should it be catagorical and to what extent at the state level? General versus catagorical aid; state aid, federal aid or both? What partnership should exist? How much control? These are issues which are prevalent, present and controversial.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Who is accountable? How do you determine who is accountable? How do you plan for accountability? How do you know what should be done, unless clear-cut, well-defined objectives are first planned? How can you hold a person accountable when you are not sure what he is supposed to be doing? Schools do different things in different ways. The question then of objectives and accountability, becomes one that should be of grave concern to every Chief State School Officer. It is not suggested here what accountability should be or how it should be maintained, or who should be accountable for what, but it is suggested that accountability is an issue that must be faced more realistically in the years ahead if the public is to continue to do and say what it believes a school should be and how it should operate.

DISCIPLINE

The results of a Gallup Poll, as published in the Phi Delta Kappan in a recent issue, pointed out that the American public, the general public, the citizen and taxpayer, believed that discipline was the number one problem in the American school system. It was pointed out that the use of narcotics, vandalism, destruction of property, premarital sex and pregnant girls who were in high schools, and even junior high, the general behavior of boys and girls, attacks on teachers, and all of these fell in the category of discipline problems.

To talk about discipline is to talk about purposes and goals of the schools. If we believe--as many people say we do--that there should be opportunity, and equal opportunity, for every child to attend school, then what are the goals for a widely divergent population across this nation?

Unless we establish goals and provide the programs, how can we attack the problem of discipline when perhaps the very thing we are doing is causing a part of the problem and causing the student to reject what is happening? How do we plan a program, how do we account for the development of ideas in such a way that boys and girls know and understand the role of the school and will feel that they have a part in and a responsibility for carrying out the program of education? We may idealistically say that education is for the welfare and the sake of the child but unless the child somehow comes to accept this, perhaps it is idle chatter.

Who determined the goals for these people, and how did we arrive at the decision that certain things are good for John or William or Mary? How do we work with homes and communities and churches, YMCA's and YMHA's, and all the rest so that a different attitude toward schools, a respect for property, a respect for authority become a part of the general atmosphere in the school?

It is my suggestion that we deal with this in a very critical way in an attempt to find answers before we bring the institution down around our ears by something that in all probability can be handled effectively.

Another topic mentioned in the Gallup Poll was that of busing. Some of the questions appear to be appropriate when we are considering busing and the impact on the schools.

Immediately after the Supreme Court decision it was assumed that the problems resided largely in the South. It seemed that the "bad guys" were in the Southeastern Region and the "good guys" were in the rest of the nation. The fellows in the "white hats" talking about what the South should do resided for the most part in the big cities and the large states. However, after some 10 to 15 years of busing, integration, and the problems that went

with it, it is now developing that some of the "bad guys" may reside in Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland or some of the other big cities. These cities have not attacked and solved their problem.

The question of integrating schools, even in Washington, D.C., is of questionable value. Many have not been integrated, except in theory. The white flight out of Washington has left the schools largely black, and the white flight out of many of the large cities has left the schools largely black. The question then becomes; if the schools become black anyway, how do you deal with this in such a way that the original intent--which appeared to be both social as well as educational--is achieved?

This is no effort on my part to try to solve the problem; it is to suggest that there may be some sinners in places other than schools and that the solution to the problem may rest with housing more realistically than in the school building. The question has not been answered yet as to how riding a school bus for an hour each day can improve the educational quality for a child. Neither has the question been answered about how not riding a school bus could be used to provide a much better program of education. These have been talked about superficially, but the real issue is how do we deal with both black children and white children so that both gain and so that neither one is going to suffer as a result of what might be done through busing. This is not to take issue with the Supreme Court decision, it is not to take issue with the busing situation; it is simply to point out that we have not solved the problem by the Supreme Court decision, federal court decision, by rules and guidelines handed down by some who have been designated to implement the programs.

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND NATIONAL CURRICULUM

When the original idea was suggested that national assessment should

be started and federal funds should be provided for a top-level group of researchers to conduct national assessment, opposition was expressed immediately from many sources. The opposition simply stated that situations vary so greatly from state to state, and within the states, that it would be impossible to develop one test that would measure all the things to be measured, if accuracy and reliability were to be established. It was also stated that the purpose of starting this kind of national assessment was to lay the general groundwork for national curriculum.

Not so, shouted the proponents of the idea and those that were supporters of the idea of national assessment. It was their purpose, they stated, to provide some accurate information so that schools at the local level and schools at the state level could change their curriculum, their programs, their organizational patterns to do what would be identified and to correct what would be identified as weaknesses in their own programs. Local systems and state systems were not doing this and, therefore, someone should be doing it for them.

After several years of national assessment, what has happened? I shall not attempt to reach conclusions with you but to raise the very pertinent question: what has your state done to modify its program, its offerings, its objectives to comply with the weaknesses suggested by the national assessment? Some may say that national assessment was not designed to identify our problems to that extent, but rather on a regional basis. This may be true, but my question still persists. What impact has national assessment had in your state on your educational program for elementary and secondary school children? What has resulted from the expenditure of several million dollars in this enterprise? What have you done--if anything--and what will you do--if anything--in the future, and what impact will national assessment, with its expenditure of millions of dollars, have on your schools?

What are you planning, how are you working with it, or are you simply ignoring the whole business? It appears that a day of reckoning should come somewhere and from someone. Perhaps the Chief State School Officers should say, "this is great, proceed with it, it will revolutionize education, let's get on with the business;" or we should say, "we have spent the dollars, we have made the studies and nothing is happening, so let's forget it and spend the money somewhere else." The question, however, is an issue, and in many conferences questions are raised about national curriculum, national assessment impact; so, what is the answer? How do we deal with it? How do we handle this issue?

There are several other issues that I would like to identify simply as issues without much discussion about any of them.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The next issue will be that raised by vocational education programs. What is the partnership role of the states and the federal government in providing an adequate program in vocational/technical education for boys and girls who are not college bound or boys and girls who may be college bound, but who want a vocational/technical education? How do we put these together and provide for this program in a nation such as ours? Colleges and universities are not sufficient. Vocational/technical schools are a must if we are to have a balanced program. And, how do we handle it, how do we fund it, what kind of program do we need, how much of it do we need, who determines it, and how should it be handled?

EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

In recent years, parents have demanded that equal opportunity be provided for children that may be classified as exceptional children. The

contention has been made, and rightfully so, that mentally retarded children with speech and hearing defects, blind children, and the like have not received the same opportunity for education that other children have received. Federal courts have ruled in several instances that equal opportunity must be provided. State legislatures are enacting laws which not only require equal opportunity but in many cases have special conditions which must be met. Obviously, it requires a great deal more money per pupil to provide an equal opportunity for these children than for regular, normal children. Where does the responsibility for education begin with these children? Is it at age zero? How long does it continue--is it age 21, 24, or even 30? If these special provisions are made for these children, then what about the same opportunity for other children not included in these categories? If identification and classification are required at age 1 for these children, what about other children? If educational programs are provided at 2,3,4, and 5, what are the implications for other children? How much money should be spent extra? Even though some patterns are developing, these questions have not as yet been answered satisfactorily.

The entire question of how these services shall be provided is a very debatable question. Mainstreaming versus non-mainstreaming, residential schools versus regular schools, resource centers, consultants, specialists, classroom teachers, and teacher aides are all topics of lively discussion when education for exceptional children is mentioned.

The issue which evolves around funding for these children is a very acute one. It would appear to the writer that all of these topics are ones which should be considered by the Chief State School Officers--not with any attempt to secure final answers but in an effort to secure better answers than are available at the present time.

OBJECTIVE, GENERAL

The next topic would be general objective. How do we, in this nation, establish the goals and objectives for our schools? Do we have a clear-cut understanding about what each school system in each state is supposed to be doing, or do we leave it to the locality, the local school system, the local board, the local superintendent, to determine what that school will do and how it will be accomplished?

I know we give a lot of lip service to this; but really and honestly, what is the number 1, or 2, or 3, or 4 objective of American education today? Yes, the seven cardinal principles had a part to play--they still do. There are other principles that have a part to play--they still do. But what, really, are we trying to do to improve the elementary and secondary schools of this country? Can you identify 5 things that every state is doing? Are they important? What are they? It seems to me to be important and very necessary that we look at goals of education for elementary and secondary schools.

OTHER QUESTIONS

I would like to raise some other questions about early guidelines. How do we get early guidelines developed by the U.S. Office? How do the Chief State School Officers have an impact on federal legislation? How do the local superintendents, in cooperation with the Chief State School Officer, have an impact on federal legislation? What are the programs that are most important? What kind of programs, what kind of funding, what general philosophy should we have as reference to education for exceptional children? Recognizing as we do that the great contributions will be made from our intellectually gifted and our able people, how do we provide for them? Have we done it, or what can we do? Recognizing in addition that a great work force in this nation contributes to our economy, how can we

train them, how do we prepare them--does the school have a role or not?

These are some of the issues that come to mind as I think of the issues across the nation and the importance that should be attached to them.

LOUISIANA

Louis J. Michot
State Superintendent of Education

INTRODUCTION

The intent of this paper is to identify some of the problems facing states as a result of federally legislated education programs. It would be presumptuous to attempt to define all those problems. It would be equally as presumptuous to attempt to begin such an identification of problems without stating that federal programs have been a positive force. New programs have been created, good programs generated, and a national interest and emphasis in education has been and is continuing to be initiated by Congress and the Office of Education. There is much good to be recognized and it is my hope in citing some of the problems that we may jointly work to solve them and continue to improve education through objective, positive teamwork.

IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL PROBLEMS

The enactment of the Education Amendments of 1974, after more than a year of Congressional consideration and compromise, represents a melting pot of new, revised, and warmed-over federal programs. The Amendments have been termed as an Act "to extend and amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes." The heart of the Act is the extension and modification of Title I, compensatory aid to disadvantaged children. However, the legislation extends to other programs and the provisions

of these programs, as those of Title I, are being affected by the process of regulations and guidelines.

According to recent testimony at oversight hearings on the Education Amendments of 1974, the Office of Education proposed regulations for ESEA Title I and a variety of problems with consolidation seemed to be bothering chief state school officers and Federal programs coordinators more than anything else.

The process of formulating regulations and guidelines within the Office of Education has caused a great deal of unhappiness among educators and Congress. The way that federal bureaucrats have prepared regulations for some education laws resulted in Congress providing a means to review draft regulations. Under the Education Amendments of 1974, Congress may review draft regulations and if necessary or desirable, reject those regulations by concurrent resolution of both houses.

The regulations or guidelines drafted by officials in the executive branch of the Federal Government provide both federal administrators and potential grant recipients with precise information on how to allocate or qualify for appropriated funds. The problems occur when the regulations become too exacting, too precise, and at times exceed the very intent of the law. When the intent of the law is exceeded and misinterpreted, the impact is far-reaching and creates confusion, disharmony, and a halting of the progress of education.

For instance, the regulations proposed for governance of Title I comparability requirements have created an inflexibility for states that equalize expenditures down to the local school. The regulations should be flexible enough to allow a resolution of conflicts between state equalization efforts and the regulations on comparability.

The Title I regulations require comparing the average non-Title I schools with each Title I school. According to some educators, such a method is not statistically sound and the states and local education agencies should be allowed to develop their own criteria to prove comparability and then submit that criteria to the Commissioner for approval.

The Title I regulations applicable to teacher training are not sufficiently specific as to which teachers may be in training and for how long.

The regulations governing the Simplified State Application under Title IV, Consolidation of Certain Education Programs, are structured such that the "simplified state application" is a complete misnomer. The annual program plans required by the regulations must contain everything that used to go into state plans which makes the general application additional paper work. To compound the problem, programs which didn't need a state application at all before, now have to submit a yearly program plan to the Office of Education for approval.

These are but a few of the serious problems affecting states and local education agencies as a result of imposed regulations which restrict and confound the progress of education.

Regulations are one ailment which determine the health of the law. Another is appropriations. These two elements have more impact than the law itself on state education activities and the programs of local school districts.

Appropriations are the monies actually available for expenditure; authorizations are funds the Congress may provide for education laws. However, there is almost always a decided gap between what might be spent and what is actually available for expenditure. The authorization figures included in an act are influenced primarily by members of the education committees of Congress; appropriations are influenced by the President's budget request. Hence, the

ever-present gap between the two amounts results in somewhat less effective programs or at other times, no programs at all. Such a problem is a frequent visitor to a piece of legislation and it is not uncommon for parts of the law to receive no funding. The program is authorized but no money is appropriated.

The passage of the fiscal year 1976, Education Appropriations Bill provides approximately $750 million above fiscal year 1975 levels. However, the President's budget for education was approximately $775 million below comparable 1975 levels. The appropriations bill is a billion dollars over the budget. President Ford has repeatedly said he will veto appropriations that exceed his budget requests.

Congressional insistance on a high level of education funding is faced with the deferral prospect under the new budget process. Under the new Budget and Impoundment Control Act which became law last year, a deferral becomes effective immediately when requested and continues until either House adopts a resolution of disapproval.

The appropriation process and the regulation process can easily be identified as the front-runners in education problems. If these two elements are not functioning smoothly, education across the nation becomes adversely affected. The impact of confounding, poorly structured regulations and a fight to the finish on the amount of money to be appropriated throws the entire education system on a backwards course.

The provision of the Education Amendments of 1974 has placed a joint obligation upon each of the states and the United States Commissioner of Education to compile, analyze, and report the allocation of state-administered Federal education funds within the State. The existing and pending legislative reporting requirements have molded state reporting capacities to operate and cope under fragmented, redundant and confusing circumstances.

Public Law 93-556, The Commission of Federal Paper Work, has with justification declared that, "Federal information report requirements have placed an unprecedented paper work burden upon private citizens, recipients of Federal assistance, business, governmental contractors, and state and local governments." Levels of such unprecedented paper work have never been so apparent and demanding as they are in the educator sector. Examples of the reporting requirements are overwhelming; the cost in funds and staff time of the Federal, state and local levels are astronomical with an inestimable detrimental impact on the services provided by state and local education agencies.

At present, there are twenty-two mandated studies required by the passage of Public Law 93-380. Demands in these reporting requirements will be increased and complicated by the establishment of the new fiscal year. Couple that problem with untimely appropriations and it is apparent that state and local education agencies are placed in unmanageable positions.

There are countless examples of what appear to state and local education agencies as fragmented and uncoordinated reporting requirements. The mandated studies, the new Federal fiscal year, and untimely appropriations are but a few.

Congress is getting more and more verbose and taxpayers are shelling out more than $108 million this fiscal year to pay for the verbal inflation.

The public printer has estimated that there will be a volume increase of 43 per cent in copies of hearings, congressional debates, bills and resolutions and the recommended appropriation for the Government Printing Office for fiscal 1976 is $108,500,000.

State Departments of Education have been negligent in assuming the leadership role in providing Congress with the kind of information needed. By that, I mean that states must be able to communicate effectively the

impact and difficulty that some reporting requirements imposed on state and local education agencies are causing.

Each of the areas cited as critical problems - regulations, guidelines, appropriations and reporting requirements - represent ailments in the education system. As stated earlier, these are not all the problems, but they are indicative of some of the most serious malfunctions. At the same time, these areas identified as problems can be the key opportunities to contribute to the health of the education system. If the problem is identified, the cure cannot be far off as long as we work as a team to implement that cure.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

The importance of taking advantage of opportunities to change and improve the education system cannot be overestimated. Problems have been identified and now it is our responsibility to suggest methods to alleviate those problems. The recommendations outlined below are suggestions for a beginning:

Recommendation No. 1. Establish an organized procedure to work with the Office of Education in drafting proposed regulations and guidelines for various federal programs prior to official publication in the Federal Register.

Such a procedure should be documented and approved by the Chief State School Officers and forwarded to the Office of Education for concurrence.

Recommendation No. 2. Provide for a more timely dissemination of information on federal legislation and appropriation measures to each Chief State School Officer.

Recommendation No. 3. Assure a systematic and comprehensive coordination of all activities of Federal, State and local agencies which relate to education information, reporting requirements and Congressional data needs.

Recommendation No. 4. Establish a working relationship with the Congress to assure that Congressional information needs are understood and can be met prior to the establishment of legislative mandates.

NOTE: Recommendations No. 3 and No. 4 are not intended to conflict with the efforts of the Committee on Evaluation and Information Systems.

MAINE

H. Sawin Millett, Jr.
State Commissioner of Educational and Cultural Services

The following list of educational issues I believe represent some of the more critical problems we in Maine are faced with:

1. Declining student enrollments and the resultant impact on program quality and staffing;
2. Collective bargaining and its impact on local management decision-making;
3. Student discipline in view of current attitudes and recent court decision;
4. Legislative attempts at expanding the mission of the public school without providing additional funding;
5. Mobility of student population and the resulting impact on facility and program planning;
6. Need to provide more meaningful inservice education programs for teachers;
7. Federal vs state vs local control of education;
8. The shifting balance of teacher supply and demand and its impact on the employment of teachers;
9. Student attendance and the truancy-dropout problems;
10. Working the "bugs" out of a new school finance law;

11. Providing meaningful educational programs for the handicapped when a mandatory law requires compliance at a faster rate than such programs can be developed;
12. The governance of teacher certification;
13. The most efficient means of delivering high-cost vocational programs;
14. The governance of post-secondary education;
15. The impact which the courts and the federal government are having on local educational policy.

This list is by no means intended to be a complete one. I can amplify further upon these issues as the format of the conference requires.

MARYLAND

James A. Sensenbaugh
State Superintendent of Schools

The State of Maryland has been working on a number of concerns, and has been making some progress toward their solution. However, much more needs to be done. Among those problems which will be in the forefront in the immediate years ahead are these, not given in any order or priority:

Funding Education Costs

As other vital services for people compete with education for funds financing schools will become more difficult. Educators will need to demonstrate more clearly their need for tax dollars and will have to assure the effective use of the dollars they receive.

While it may be easy to calculate financial resources on a simple formula approach to budgeting, funding formulas which are not predictable and which do not contribute to program effectiveness will not be tolerated in future years. Equity in school support will probably come through compre-

hensive planning and accurate budgeting rather than by fictitious formulas. A true cost effective tool will need to be developed in order for school systems to have the proper information in making decisions on alternative programs and spending. Factors of student needs, cost differences among locations, and local capabilities of support will be the type of information on which a funding model ought to be based.

Maryland is beginning to experience this direction in its support for transportation where computerized scheduling and routing of buses has been utilized. A step in the same direction has been taken for special education where a system of data collection has been used for funding. A third example is the school contruction program which is based upon actual needs, school system by school system, rather than by formula allocation.

Concerted effort ought to be made among the states to develop techniques for data collection and interpretation which will be basic to funding based on actual needs of the various aspects of school operations. When this happens every child can better be assured of an adequate education, regardless of the happenstance of residence. Equity then will be measured in terms of programs received, rather than dollars spent.

Of course, there still remains the problem of appropriate sharing at the various levels--local, state, federal.

Special Education

Education of the handicapped is a major problem confronting Maryland in the years immediately ahead. Not only does a court decree (1974) resulting from a class action suit brought by the Maryland Association for Retarded Children against certain Maryland school systems and the State make mandatory educational programs for the handicapped but also the General Assembly of 1973 mandated adequate educational programs for all handicapped children by 1980.

For FY 1976 the State of Maryland has allocated $43 million which, added to sums appropriated by the 24 local school systems, will be in the neighborhood of a $90 million package for special education. It is anticipated that accommodation, as mandated, to meet all the special needs by FY 1980 will require a total annual sum of $150 million above the normal budgets of previous years, at current dollar values.

Among questions to be resolved are these:

What children are entitled to benefit from special programs of education?

How can all the children eligible be identified?

How can adequate programs for the multiplicity of needs be developed?

How should the programs be funded and what is the appropriate sharing at the various levels of government--national, state and local?

Early Childhood Education (Pre-Kindergarten)

At a time when the country is endeavoring to eliminate vestiges of discrimination in employment based on sex there is the concurrent demand to provide for the needs of preschool children during the working hours of the parents. The mechanism by which these needs are accommodated as well as the financial means to cover program costs are problems which will be confronting administrators, public and private, in the years ahead.

Educators must realize things, good or bad, will be done for or to these small children who are in need of supervision for many of their waking hours. It is important that the time be put to good advantage. Certainly other agencies, such as health, mental hygiene and social services, have a logical stake in providing programs for the early period of life. However, education has a big role if not the dominant one, in seeing that opportunities are properly utilized. Additionally, the declining school enrollment in many areas should make available public owned facilities which could be utilized to good

advantage for preschool age boys and girls.

The opportunities are far too precious for educators to side-step under allegations of responsibility of others, excessive cost or inappropriate philosophy.

Adult Education

It is difficult to realize that in spite of universal opportunities for schooling, today 27.4 percent of Maryland's 2,082,000 adults age 25 and over are lacking an eighth grade education. An even greater number, 48 percent, have not graduated from high school. Consequently, basic and secondary education for adults are high priority programs. The success of the persons involved in adult programs will be determined by the opportunity for continual learning as one obtains basic skills and begins to climb the ladder of growth as a worker, as a parent, as a citizen and as an individual.

While providing programs in basic subjects and specialized skills for work opportunities are generally accepted and accommodated, at least in part, frequently overlooked is the need for programs oriented to parenthood and other life coping skills, whether a parent or not. What is being done to assist adults confronted by the complexities of life--the many regulations in licensing, in taxation, in credit buying, in estate planning; the problems incident to crime, to drugs, to liability; and the traumatic experiences in divorce, in protracted illnesses, in death?

Keeping a job and dealing with life's frustrations are a major part of every adult's life. Additionally, the individual needs educational programs which will bring life fulfillment. The photography class, the seminar on great books, the cooking and sewing labs may lead to additional or even primary income for the adult. More often, however, these programs fill the important needs of leisure, mental and emotional growth, and socialization.

The influx of refugees from Vietnam and Cambodia is a stark reminder of America's continuous absorption of new citizens. For these newcomers and for all Americans the roles and responsibilities of citizenship are a source of educational need. Schools have an obligation to help its citizens get in tune with and stay in tune with society and changing times.

Career Education

The concept of career education has emerged, over the past four or five years, as a strategy for strengthening existing educational programs at practically all levels.

Obviously, the implementation of career education involves some degree of change in existing educational programs. Staff members need to be trained, existing curriculum needs to be analyzed and modified, and some resources of materials will need to be re-allocated or developed. Most schools have found that the advantages of incorporating career concepts into the existing program have more than compensated for whatever costs are involved in the changes.

In Maryland, most of the school systems have followed the State Board of Education in naming career education as a priority. The State Department of Education, in cooperation with local school systems, has conducted extensive training, operated model projects, and developed resource materials. This session of the General Assembly provided the first funds for career education--to be used to train nearly 300 counselors in strengthening career guidance.

In spite of the public support and the enthusiasm of most educators for career education, much remains to be done in the State within the next several years. The identified needs include:

1. Increased State support for staff and program development, especially for the smaller school systems in the State.

2. Continued and increased resources within the State Department of Education, consistent with the priority nature of career education.
3. Special emphasis on the development of processes through which the effectiveness of career education programs may be determined.
4. Greater involvement of other departments, other agencies, other institutions and the community.

Acceleration of Learning

For school chiefs who have spent fifty years on this good earth it is not difficult to recognize the fantastic developments which have occurred during that period of time--intellectually, scientifically, industrially, socially. If, as we are told, at the end of the next fifty years what we know today will constitute but 3% of the knowledge package, schools will need to exercise care in what they endeavor to teach or the competencies they hope to develop.

Obviously no one will be able to master this growing stock of knowledge, nor would it be desirable to do so. What is important is the competency to select vital information from the vast storehouse and bring it to bear upon the solution of problems pertinent to the individual.

Not unique to any one state but common to all concerned with educating will be the challenge to accelerate the learning process, and to help one to sharpen skills in identifying issues and problems, in selecting and applying vital content, and frequently in acting without the benefit of prior experience directly or vicariously. Education in times of rapid knowledge and intellectual expansion takes on a sense of urgency.

An analysis of processes and techniques available for learning and the selection of those contributing most effectively to success are an important phase of the educational enterprise. Although schools may not be utilizing

as well as they should what is already known to be good, educators must be on the alert to discover still better ways of teaching. Research, innovation and dissemination should be playing an increasing role in the years ahead.

Vitality in the Curriculum

A continual problem confronting schools is that of keeping content updated. Too often schools teach to what has been rather than what is or what will be.

Where once we taught problems of a democracy we ought now to be expanding this content to problems of the world community. Because we live in close proximity with other cultures of the world, brought about largely through improved communications and transportation, we find that people problems have a great deal of commonality around the globe. The problems of environment, of conservation, of overpopulation, of poverty, of food, of consumer protection, of housing, of recreation, of health--all these and others are current in every country, though variable in intensity, and have effect beyond the borders. As Dr. Champion Ward indicated in last summer's institute global understanding needs to be developed in terms of common humanity.

Doubtless the dropout problem in many of our high schools is due in part to the fact that much of what is taught has little or no meaning to the student. Teachers need to know what it is which has meaning to the students and make contact at the points of relevance. Many high schools operate on outmoded requirements for graduation. Attention should be given to these requirements in order that flexibility to cover a wide range of students and student interests is provided. Maryland recently has taken a look at its requirements and hopefully the new standards, when completely implemented, will provide the degree of flexibility needed.

America is strong because of its diversity. The curriculum should be characterized in a similar manner.

Elimination of Discrimination

Although much progress has been made in eliminating discrimination from schools in Maryland based on racial and religious differences and plans are under way for doing likewise on the basis of sex, still much remains to be accomplished.

The numbers game may have some merit in identifying the extent of resolution of the problem. The 20% disproportion from the norm of the minority group in a school system utilized by HEW is a purely statistical approach to the problem and does not take into account causative factors. The problem of satisfying HEW compliance assurances evolves out of residential housing patterns which have as common denominators monoethnicity, economic status and sheer discrimination of whatever vintage imaginable. It is unfortunate that the federal government expects one service (education) to correct what it permits another service (housing) to create.

The utilization of busing, when used discreetly, can be an assist in solving the problem. Unfortunately in many large population centers the logistics in accommodating large numbers becomes cumbersome and expensive, at a time when dollars are becoming increasingly difficult to come by. In large urban areas, the metropolitan concept exists in matters related to business, cultural enrichment activities, sewage and water. It does not exist as a viable concept when related to the desegregation of public schools.

The years ahead will be very crucial to education in Maryland and the nation. Unfortunately, the solutions apparently will have to emanate from the political sector. More importantly, educators must realize that schools exist to educate children, that poor human relations robs even the best achiever from realizing his full potential. Failure to learn to live devoid of fear in multiethnic situations today will have grave implications for the future.

Elimination of discrimination is far greater than proximity of human bodies. More difficult is the elimination of the subleties of the problem--the attitudes, the working relations, the content of instruction, employment practices. There cut out a big task for education as we move into the future.

Promotion of Educational Progress Through Leadership

It is with considerable chagrin that one school chief (perhaps there are others) recognizes many positive developments in recent years, at least changes in the operation of schools, have been brought about outside of the leadership in education. While educators have been busy in finding funds, facilities, furnishings and formats to accommodate numbers, others, especially the courts, have been calling the shots in the direction of social movement as if affects education. Perhaps this is the way it has always been, perhaps this is the way it should be.

In the last ten or so years the courts have decreed the demise of the dual system of education, equal employment opportunities relative to race and then to sex, rights of the handicapped to free education, necessity of bilingual instruction, the liability of board members, and the equitable support of eduction. Courts have been noted for making landmark decisions over the years which have had far reaching effects upon education. However, it does seem that recent years have brought on an exceptional period of activity, which should give pause to the discerning educator to postulate whether he has been giving direction as he or she ought.

Should school chiefs, state and local, be on the forefront of social progress and accordingly endeavor to move education forward without being pressed into action by the courts?

MASSACHUSETTS

Gregory R. Anrig
State Commissioner of Education

Educational Strategies in Increasingly Unfavorable Fiscal Envoronments

I. Direct Indications and Causes of Crisis

a) declining revenues on state and local levels

b) increasing "built-in" costs of existing educational and social welfare programs on Federal, State and local level

c) public school costs have gone up at a rate nearly four times that of the Consumer Price Index during the last seven years

d) a national administration seeking to deemphasize Federal aid and intervention in state and local programs

e) an apparent lack of fit between the existing job market and entry level skills, on the one hand, and the emphases of existing educational programs on the other

II. Complicating Factors

a) declining pupil enrollments following an extended period of educational expansion

b) increasing public disillusionment with the apparent failure of schools to provide pupils with basic skills

c) growing hostility on the part of state legislatures and local taxpayers to the burden of continually increasing educational expenditures with little apparent effort by educators to control rising costs

d) the image of public schools as unable to control increasing student drug/alcohol use, violence, and vandalism

e) pervasiveness of racial and socio-economic isolation in

urban schools

f) increasing intervention of the courts in matters of educational rights and remedies

III. Pre-existing Educational Goals

a) increase in student achievement levels in the area of basic academic skills

b) the elimination of obstacles to equal access to educational services on the basis of race, sex, language, and/or wealth of community of residence

c) the integration of schools and the educational process with the realities of local community life, with special emphasis on the transition from school to work

IV. Strategies for the Future

a) the public demonstration by educators of fiscal responsibility through more rigorous administration and cost control procedures, while seeking to avoid sacrifices in educational quality; greater utilization of services from other social service agencies at the local and state level and clarification of roles and responsibilities of all family-serving public institutions

b) increasing resort to long-range planning to generate broadly drawn future strategies to ease the painful consequences of an inevitable shrinkage in the size of the public educational establishment

c) a greater degree of openness to public demands for information about and input into educational decision-making

d) an effort to provide a clearer public vision of the somewhat limited capabilities of schools as vehicles for social problem solving

e) an increased willingness to resort to regional and metropolitan solutions to problems which escape the capacities of individual local school systems

f) increased attention to alternative uses for existing educational facilities and personnel

MICHIGAN

John W. Porter
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

INTRODUCTION

There are many problems confronting public elementary and secondary education in these United States, but in my opinion, the most critical issue is the current variance between secondary schooling, a youth's educational experience, and the world of work.

In recent years, a number of articles and studies have been written on this singular issue, but none of the articles seem to offer a clear-cut simple formula for dealing with the complex issue at hand.

To date no specific proposals have been advanced which would initiate action on this most important youth problem.

In this paper, I offer to the United States Office of Education, eight specific issues which can be and should be translated into eight recommendations for action if any constructive change is to take place in responding to the critical problems which confront our youth, particularly those in urban and rural settings.

If life can be categorized according to the four life cycles of 1) rearing, 2) schooling, 3) working, and 4) retiring, and if the working cycle (which for most people is the longest) is the most rewarding as many say it is, than a much clearer articulation between the schooling and working cycles needs to emerge

in our highly technocratic society.

I offer to the Office of Education and to my colleagues, the Chief State School Officers of the United States, the following proposal as one possible solution to the "most pressing problem facing our schools."

YOUTH TRANSITION TO WORK

The United States has become the first society in the history of the world that could continue increasing its gross national product without relying upon the manpower of its youth, ages 15, 16, and 17.

Our nation's technological inventiveness is the principal reason this claim can be made, and the future holds no panacea for our youth, if persons in the work force continue to be allowed to work through age 65. Current trends anticipate most working adults being in the labor force for nearly 50 years, which means probably some major reorientation of existing objectives for high school education and other training institutions during the last quarter of the 20th Century. If these data are relatively accurate, there is probably need for some kind of a new National Manpower Policy.

The major problem which confronts American society in relationship to the issue of Youth Transition to Work is not whether or not our secondary training programs for students are realistic, but whether or not there will be sufficient job opportunities for youth to transfer from secondary schools to the world of work.

I have every reason to believe that the school programs can be improved if work opportunities are made available. However, some economists have suggested that the current recession will not be turned around to the point where our "industrial might" will be able to generate the kind of new jobs which will be necessary to cover the demands of our youth. Therefore, as one considers the long-term economic factors that will probably have to be taken into

consideration, it seems that the country as a whole will have to consider strongly a new type of job generation similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps program of the '30's, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs of the '30's. These job opportunities were generated as a result of public funding, and it may well be that private enterprise will have to rely again more heavily upon the generation of public employment jobs in the future if youth transition to work is to be satisfactory and smooth.

I have reached this conclusion based upon the present relationship of education (schooling in the narrow sense) to the basic issue of "how the young become adults," which is the "real" problem confronting our industrialized society. The rapid and significant alteration of this relationship in the past 50 years is adequately documented in a report issued in May, 1972, entitled "How Do The Young Become Adults?"[1]

The issue before the country, as Willard Wirtz has stated, is reordering the "policy," if the nation is serious about trying to interrelate education and the rest of adult life experience. Wirtz believes that without a new "policy" the educational system is subject to pursuing valiantly goals and objectives which in reality cannot be reached, thus, leading to more and more frustration and failure among our youth.[2]

It has been stated by the writer that in many instances it is not likely that the children of the present generation of the nation's leaders will be able to reach similar heights of accomplishment, because the job opportunities for doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, etc. have plateaued.

In addition to the basic issue of job generation, there are other

---

1 "How Do The Young Become Adults?" May, 1972. James S. Coleman. Report No. 130, Center for Social Organization of Schools, The John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

2 Education to Make a Living; Keynote address by Willard Wirtz, former Secretary of Labor - 1962-69; presently President of National Manpower Institute. Prepared for delivery at Education Commission of the States Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida, June 20-22, 1974.

problems which must be addressed if "Youth Transition to Work" is to become more than a slogan.

Some of the salient reasons the country cannot implement a program of youth transition to work revolve around the following assumptions:

1. The education system's assumption at the secondary level that the counseling and guidance function should remain within the educational system.
2. The education system's assumption that it can teach about the world of work and the work ethic, and then adequately place people in the work world.
3. The education system's reliance upon present manpower needs and information in shaping the courses and curriculum to be provided, which results in establishing high-cost programs which tend to outlive their usefulness.
4. The education system's belief that a highly selected segment of the population, the teachers in the schools, can be held accountable for the major responsibility of transmitting the work ethic through institutions called public schools.
5. The education system's present reliance upon so-called "career education" to solve the problems enumerated without any major structural changes in the education system itself.

There is no doubt that attention on the youth transition problem facing the country has been given added emphasis because of the interest of the President.

President Ford has suggested the need to develop a national commitment in regard to the issue of "Youth Transition to Work." As a result, three Secretaries of the Administration jointly agreed in the summer of 1974 to study the issues and recommend to the President a course of action. The Secretaries proposed the appointment of a new National Commission. The President assigned

the task to the existing National Commission on Manpower Policy. The issue before the Manpower Commission is not "education" but "jobs."

Such an approach seems plausible at first glance because it restricts the persons eligible and it presupposes some transitional training in the schools. However, some very intriguing statistics have emerged which point out that for every 100 entering high school ninth graders, only 70 complete high school, 30 of whom go on to college, with only 10 ending up with a college degree. Such statistics raise interesting questions as to what approach should be taken. For example. Should a National Manpower Policy on Youth Transition take into consideration the 100, the 70, the 30, or the 10?

I believe it is reasonable to focus on "what happens after young people leave secondary school or college," but one cannot overlook the fact that many people drop out of the system and at alarming rates in the inner cities where the employment problem is the most depressing.

Although probably not essential, it would be appropriate to seek the advice of knowledgeable persons who could assume the task of preparing working papers on policy related themes, such as:

1. The dimensions of the problem and the state of current knowledge.
2. Employer practices regarding the hiring of youth.
3. Community case studies of improved linkages among institutions.
4. An assessment of the federal government's programs related to youth employment.
5. Bridges to work: European experience.
6. Work study programs: their status and potential expansion.
7. Special problems of minority youth and women.
8. The challenges that migrants face.
9. The competence of school leavers.

10. Alternative maturational models.

11. Closing the informational gap.

12. Training structures, including apprenticeship.

Such a series of papers might be useful for a conference, but at this point of little utility in dealing with the fundamental issue which faces the country, and that is "that many of the youth are not now prepared to enter the job market upon leaving the schools," or "if they are prepared the jobs are not available to all who seek them."

Once a person has traveled through the school ill-equipped to face the work reality, or has left school because of its unreality, or has acquired the skills but cannot find a job, a bitter taste of democracy is left unsweetened. But that is, in effect, exactly what is transpiring.

It should be noted that this is not the fault of the secondary schools, since they were not created in the first place to carry out this task of "Youth Transition to Work," nor have they in the second place been given the societal support necessary to achieve this objective.

This paper focuses upon two problems which confront the politicians and educators of the country:

-- The first problem is that there are not enough jobs to absorb the qualified; and

-- The second problem is that the schools are not turning out students with adequate skills to be hired without major retraining.

Because of these two problems, I would propose that before any studies are undertaken to determine what happens after young people leave school, <u>that the National Commission establish a policy framework on Youth Transition to Work</u>, which means that in either case the issues are job creation and job training.

Such a policy framework could appropriately focus upon the current American Youth Dilemma, which can be described in three recent changes in

American culture:

1. A major shift in the basic purpose of secondary schools;
2. The establishment of universal attendance;
3. The increasing variance between schooling and education.

Issue No. I

Secondary schools until recent years were not held "accountable" for the effective transition of youth to work. Most work prior to World War II was manual labor or agriculture related. As a result, youth who were motivated could leave school and find adequate employment. The men of the country were also dispersed in society and were able to assist in the youth transition to work process. This is not the case today.

As a result, secondary schools are now saddled with the full responsibility, since our adult men and now women have retreated to the business and industrial complexes of the suburbs and downtown edifices with little firsthand contact with youth of today. To solve the current youth transition problem, the business and industrial complex must assume a greater share of the responsibility for job experiences by creating within their establishments "Youth Service Job Opportunities."

Issue No. II

Since the second World War, the nation has set as a goal, universal high school education. Such a goal is lofty and desirable, but it creates problems heretofore not realized.

Secondary students generally fall into three categories as they progress through the schools. One category is the so-called college bound; another is the general education-vocational education student; and the third is the dropout. The secondary school in most instances is unable to handle the needs of those not geared to academic credits, and the labor market has made no provision for absorbing them since the high school diploma has become an entry card to even

the most menial of jobs.

While focusing upon a policy of youth transition to work after young people leave school, it will also be necessary to establish a better in-school work/study program which will effectively prohibit the 10.5 million secondary students, age 17 and less, from becoming statistical casualties of the Labor Department figures.

To correct the twofold problems involved, such students should be given a so-called "Youth Service Job Status" as long as their primary goal is educational preparation, thus reflecting a truer labor market picture and eliminating the youth from active competition with the adult job seekers.

Issue No. III

At no other time in the history of mankind has the variance between secondary school expectations and job-related education been so great. Because of this variance, it is possible that the 70-75 percent high school completion is the maximum achievable under the present structure of the educational system. In urban centers, due in part to a 60-75 percent absenteeism, the completion rate drops sometimes to below 50 percent, which argues for some kind of new incentives.

It would seem that a return to the concept of job placement and follow-up needs to become an integral part of an education-business-government consortium, in order to close the gap between schooling and education. This may necessitate state and federal legislation to implement and finance a counseling and guidance system which is related to the real world of living and directly involves the employment service, educational institutions, labor, and the employers.

Growing out of this discussion are a series of issues which need to be discussed if any meaningful attempts at solving the Youth Transition to Work issue is to be realized.

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

1. A National Manpower Policy that would generate job opportunities after young people leave school.
2. A generation of "Youth Service Job Opportunities" for some 7.5 million senior high school students (grades 11-12).
3. A tentatively planned program for the 6.0 million 9th and 10th year students who are teetering between "dropping out" and "holding on."
4. A plan whereby no senior high school student be required to spend more than a half day in the high school building.
5. A minimum of one semester credit for optional community service work, which is job related, according to established standards.
6. A system of contractual arrangements to implement school-work related experiences, such as co-op, on-the-job-training, etc.
7. A procedure whereby the business and industrial community assumes a major responsibility for youth transition counseling and guidance.
8. A state-federal financed program of job placement and follow-up, utilizing the cooperative efforts of education, labor, business, and government.

---

*These principles are predicated upon increasing job opportunities for after school youth. If according to Willard Wirtz, in a speech given on August 1, 1974 at the CCSSO Institute in Jackson Hose, Wyoming, that there will not be a major increase in job opportunities, particularly at the nonprofessional and technical levels, the need for such principles is even more paramount.

MINNESOTA

Howard B. Casmey
State Commissioner of Education

Our domestic educational system has been concurrently impacted by an explosion of knowledge as well as increasingly justifiable competition for

resources from other institutions. This has resulted in the requirement for educators to teach more with less.

Problems evidenced by statistics over time indicate that traditional education methods are unable to resolve the historic and projected paradox. Because traditional education is labor--intensive, major cost reductions cannot be effected without commensurate quality reductions. To make education responsive within anticipated economic constraints requires changing the base of the education institution from a labor to a capital-intensive industry.

In Minnesota we have been actively investigating this possibility, and have come to the conclusion that the same tool that created the knowledge explosion can be harnessed to provide the solution to our educational dilemma. That tool is the computer.

More specifically, the application of a computer system has been identified as the most probable vehicle to both enhance the quality and breadth of education while reducing the expense of this education's delivery. The system PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automatic Teaching Operations) has been in development for 11 years and has fully-developed and proven hardware and software. Its initial installations in an elementary and secondary setting requires a subsidy for courseware development and equipment manufacture.

Courseware, or the translation of conventional curriculum to computerized curriculum, is available for purchase in certain areas and can also be developed by local teachers. Hardware, because it is not being created in large quantities, is more expensive to build and acquire today than it will be in five years (witness the price of electronic calculators five years ago vs. today).

Because of the experience we have already had with computer application in education, as well as our geographic proximity and consequent access to

the leaders in the field of computerized education, we feel uniquely qualified to undertake the development of what is destined to become the future educational strategy of this country.

The State of Minnesota cannot undertake this responsibility alone. We have gained the support in the development of a computer-based education capability from the largest education-oriented computer corporation. They have pledged the availability of nationally-recognized education and courseware experts in this area, as well as availability of the tens of millions of dollars of research already expended in computer-based education.

I personally see no alternative solution for our educational dilemma on the horizon. I intend to solicit your support for the development of a future-directed educational system. To further build a base of mutual understanding, I submit this white paper which addresses three principal points in detail; (1) the problems facing education, (2) the inability of traditional educational systems to solve these problems and, (3) alternative solutions.

I. The problems facing elementary and secondary education.

Every journey begins with a first step. In Minnesota we began our search for an adequate method of educating our citizens with a goal. In pursuit of this goal we identified four basic concerns:

(1) achieving equality of education

(2) meeting individual student needs

(3) keeping pace with the knowledge explosion

(4) living within realistic economic expectations.

Each concern deals with the merging of environmental forces and their impact upon our current educational system. We recognized that to achieve our objective required that we first define these concerns and consequently find solutions. In this paper we have followed that same logic. First, we have defined each of the aforementioned concerns.

Second, we have looked at traditional educational processes' ability to overcome these concerns. And last, we have defined the role of the computer and its linkage with traditional educational techniques as a system of education in the future.

1. Achieving Equality of Education

Although Americans would like to believe that because the United States is a democracy, equality of education is assured, we know that this ideal has not yet been achieved. The policies of local school districts and counties, and of state and federal departments concerned with education have been unable to meet the needs of many of their constituents and their children. Some children are virtually condemned to failure because of the social and economic disadvantages they face with their parents and communities.

Several Minnesota school districts have taken steps to provide increased educational opportunities in those schools serving concentrations of low-income or disadvantaged students. Among the steps which have lead to additional costs are:

1. A reduced student-teacher ratio in classrooms.
2. A reduction of the adult to student ratio by adding parent and community aides in classrooms.
3. Provision of additional professional and paraprofessional staff to facilitate added health and attendance services.
4. The provision of significantly larger amounts of diagnostic and referral services.
5. The provision of additional reading and math curriculum materials.
6. The provision of additional extended day programs supportive of education.
7. The provision of additional staff development for administrators,

teachers, paraprofessionals, and clerical and janitorial staff.

8. Provision of funds for additional field trips and extracurricular activities to support educational involvement for students.
9. The provision of additional dollars to support security measures.
10. The provision of nutritional support in the way of breakfast, snack, and/or lunch when circumstances so warrant.

In 1967, Minnesota established the first State Department of Human Rights in the nation, and work began on a desegregation and equalization plan because it was generally felt by Minnesotans that school segregation was legally suspect, educationally harmful, and morally wrong.

In September of 1973, the Minnesota State Board of Education established desegregation regulations which indicated that Minnesota was prepared to use legal sanctions to end racial segregation in public schools. School districts implementing desegregation/integration programs will receive additional state funds to cover increased costs in transportation, in-service training programs, staffing additions, parent participation, leadership staffs, curriculum development, and evaluation in order to insure the successful completion of these goals.

Another concern in Minnesota is for the provision of equal opportunities in education for such groups as rural children, drop-outs, and those children requiring remedial instruction.

It is hoped that the financial equalization plan will funnel more equal amounts of funding into rural communities which formerly had far less to spend on educational enhancements than the affluent city suburbs. These children may still suffer some education inequities, however, because they live so far from the learning source, the school and its teachers. Some children attending consolidated schools must spend as much as two hours on the bus going to school each morning. This may

prevent their participation in many of the special learning activities town or city schools can offer. It is also sometimes difficult to convince the most qualified teachers to come to these relatively isolated areas to teach, and, at times, the fairly small number of students in such schools can make the outlay for the hiring of teachers for such "specialty" areas as physics and french financially impossible.

The Minnesota Department of Education is also concerned about the percentage of its students who drop out of school, 7.6%. These school failures pour out into the streets -- approximately 900,000 each year across the country -- to join their predecessors. Because most of them can't read, they can't find work. Their immaturity and inactivity often combine and result in ventures into crime. The crime rate has gone up 124% from 1960 to 1971 for boys and girls under 18 years of age.

In order to more effectively combat the problem of dropouts, the Minnesota Department of Education, the Minnesota Department of Corrections, representatives from other state agencies, and representatives from Minnesota industries and businesses hope to work together more closely in the future in order to combine resources so that these problems, in which all have a common interest, may be more effectively handled.

Of special interest to the groups identified above is the problem of learning disabilities. According to the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education's Correction Programs Division, a characteristic that all institutionalized youth have in common, whether they come from sparsely populated rural areas or dense urban concentrations, is school failure.

Many studies, including research conducted by Dr. Dennis Hoganson, a Minneapolis psychologist, on populations from the Lansing Boys Training School (Michigan) and the Red Wing Boys Training School (Minnesota), indicate that reading failure may be the single most significant factor in those forms of delinquency which can be described as anti-socially aggressive.

Dr. Allan Berman, an Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Rhode Island, examined 45 incarcerated juvenile delinquents and controls in that state and found that undetected adaptive or learning disabilities play an important etiological role in the development of the life style that results in delinquency. Through his research, Dr. Berman has come to the conclusion that youngsters who become delinquent are those whose perceptual difficulties, whose learning disabilities were not diagnosed, and who were therefore caught up in the cycle of failure and despair which eventually resulted in delinquent behavior. It is fervently hoped by those agencies involved, who represent both the public and private sector, that, together, can work out appropriate remedial means of diagnosing and treating each individual student's problems, so that more appropriate and effective remedial programs, particularly reading programs, can be developed within out Minnesota schools. The state and its schools and school districts must continue to search for alternative educational delivery systems, and to explore programs geared toward increased efficiency and productivity.

2. Meeting Individual Student Needs

A second general problem facing education in our nation's schools is the challenge of meeting individual student needs. Education, in order to keep pace with today's society, must be both more highly specialized

and more general. In order to accomplish this dichotomy, schools must offer a system of education which has a higher degree of individualization, so that individual needs can be met. More attention, therefore, must be given to pupil problems as a basis for individual opportunities to learn. The task before our teachers, then, is to find for each child entrusted to them an appropriate relationship between what is to be learned, the way it is to be learned, and the learning and developmental stage the child is in. We in Minnesota are still working toward the solution of this problem.

3. Keeping pace with the "knowledge explosion"

Our job as educators is to prepare students for the future; future jobs, as future consumers and for future crises. The dynamic nature of man's existence is dramatized today by the frequency with which he faces crises. The energy crisis, the food crisis, the environmental crisis, and the inflationary crisis all serve to illustrate how complex life has become. But in times of crises, man excels. His inquisitive, creative, and adaptive nature leads him to discover new knowledge and new ways of applying old knowledge as he brings order out of chaos.

The crisis with potential for igniting major conflict is the energy crisis. Known petroleum reserves on this planet will be depleted in a few decades is developing nations begin to use oil at the rate it is consumed by industrialized countries. The severity of the problem is emphasized by the estimate that known reserves of petroleum in the United States may be depleted in a few decades. Yet, we know there is approximately twenty times as much oil in the oil shale deposits of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming than in all of our current reserves.

Extracting oil from shale may be of questionable economic value, and runs the risk of seriously damaging the environment, but man will gain the knowledge needed to solve the problem as he strives to meet the energy crisis.

Resolving crises through the discovery and use of knowledge illustrates the rapidity with which man must acquire new facts, understandings, and skills. The ever-increasing complexity of contemporary living, coupled with the commensurate frequency of crises, is leading to a knowledge explosion. It has been projected that man's acquired knowledge will double every ten years within the next half century.

How is the knowledge explosion affecting the way we live and the way we educate? First and foremost, it is providing man with the means to de-emphasize industrialization.

As we benefit from the advancements of various technologies, we also realize that most of our previously-learned information has become obsolete. In an attempt to keep pace with this explosion of knowledge, there is a trend by both individuals and institutions towards specialization. The challenge, then, is to effectively and efficiently communicate this new-found educational information from the specialists to the increasing number of individuals who have a need for it.

To keep pace with this explosion of information, some of these same technologies are being used to provide a solution for this problem. These technologies include high-capacity information storage systems and communications facilities such as:

*Work Processing Machines
*Computer Data Banks
*Information Storage and Retrieval Units
*Communications Satellites
*Video Phones

4. Living within realistic economic expectations.

As in many other states- Minnesota is spending a decreasing proportion of available revenues for education. This reality is due to changing demographics, economics and the resultant changes in politics. Clearly the problem becomes how can we achieve equally-distributed, individualized, and timely education, given continuing constraints on available resources. To explore that question, we will first analyze the ability of traditional educational systems to resolve this problem. Secondly we will take a look at a non-traditional educational system.

II. The inability of traditional educational systems to solve these problems.

The crisis situations of the last few years, involving such attempts as busing to correct inequalities, are evidences that the traditional system is generally incapable of coping with the need for equal educational opportunities across geographical and socio-economic barriers. Some characteristics inherent in the teacher-based traditional system indicate that equality simply cannot be achieved without recourse to an alternative system. Among such inhibiting characteristics are:

*Inequality of local support of teachers.
*Varied attractiveness of residence.
*Unequal population density.

These factors plus many others, tend to lend support for improving the educational programs already at the better end of the spectrum while those at the opposite end receive nothing approaching the threshold of required assistance for improvement.

Although equalization of financial support is conceivable, it is unlikely that a purely financial solution could be contrived such that educational talent becomes equally distributed as a result. Since the traditional educational systems are so fully teacher-centered, and equal distribution

of instructional talent so fully unrealistic, it is impossible to even theorize how traditional education could ever reach a satisfactory level of equality.

The problems of individualizing education in the traditional classroom setting are many. While creative experimentation has led to (a) the reorganization of the physical setting, (b) the reorganization of students into novel groupings, and (c) the reorganization of curriculum to initiate and isolate areas of teacher and student specialization, the real ability of conventional teaching methods to respond to individual student needs is found in an analysis of reading disabilities. There are children who are referred to as having "specific language disabilities." They possess an average and often above-average ability to learn. Their handicap is an inability to learn through traditional instructional methods.

Traditional Socratic methodology assumes the following two facts: (1) that a meaningful dialogue can take place between student and teacher, and (2) that the student can learn only that knowledge that exists within the teacher's intellectual reservoir. The knowledge explosion impinges upon both of these basic tenents. As the base of human knowledge grows there does not appear to be the growth in human intellect to match. As a result, we continuously develop more and more specialized functions as individuals in society. The elementary and secondary teacher lays a foundation of education that the student builds his specialized intellectual structure on vis a vis higher education. The foundation has to be strong and broad enough to serve the student's later intellectual needs. Elementary and secondary education has to be up-to-date and comprehensive. Given the knowledge explosion and man's limited ability to internalize this information at the rate it

has been generated, it is necessary to shift the role of the teacher from a disseminator of information, to a manager of information. The role of the teacher in the future must become one of selecting and distributing knowledge on an individualized need basis rather than one of verbalizing historic truisms.

Of all the problems facing traditional educational systems, the economics one is that which is most difficult to overcome. The historic way to meet the aforementioned needs of our society has been to enrich the student/teacher ratio. Teachers are becoming more and more specialized. As a result, they continuously serve a smaller and smaller student audience.

In Minnesota, as in many other states, teachers' expenses comprise over 70% of total operating expenses. The remaining 30% of expenses have been continuously cut back until further cuts would take away muscle and bone, not fat. Today the only way we can expect to meet the reduced revenues we know are coming is to examine the management of teacher expense.

Because we have been experimenting with the computer as an aid to education for the last ten years, we see a focusing of all the problems in the computer. As industry has realized, increased productivity is most readily achieved when the emphasis is shifted from investment in labor to investment in capital equipment. This change provided the basis for the industrial revolution. Perhaps it can provide the impetus for the education revolution.

Because of these problems and the inherent qualities of the computer, we envision an educational revolution in which the ever increasing variable expense of teachers is gradually supplanted by the fixed expense of computer systems.

III. A Solution to the Educational Problems

We believe the use of computers for instructional purposes will increase dramatically in the next decade. A number of forces lead us to this conclusion, but four seem to dominate: (1) the world situation is such that educational productivity must be substantially increased, (2) technological progress is making computer use educationally and economically viable, (3) educators are learning how to use computers effectively and efficiently in a wide variety of instructional environments and (4) the individual is demanding that educational processes be used that are individualized, timely and responsive to human needs.

The following remarks give an indication macroscopic of the way in which the computer affords a potential solution for the problem as stated earlier.

*Equality: Two of the major problem areas in equality of delivery are in the area of geographic dispersion and minority education. A computer terminal can be installed in any remote location that can be reached by a telephone, and a computer terminal is unbiased, infinitely patient, and ununionized.

*Individualization: If one reviews the curriculum illustrated in Appendix A (not included in this publication, but available upon request from the Minnesota State Department) the diversity of individual learning styles and of attitudinal reactions, onw quickly comes to the conclusion that the only delivery tool responsive to these phenomena is the computer. In this context, the richer and more flexible the device, the greater the potential for individualization and attitudinal improvements in the educational process.

*Knowledge Explosion: There is today a demonstrated knowledge explosion both in subject matter and in pedagogical methodology. The computer is:

* A limitless repository of knowledge;
* An extremely flexible cataloging device for such knowledge;
* A highly sophisticated diagnosis, analysis, and prescription tool.

These capabilities clearly indicate the computer as the only source of educational delivery responsive to the knowledge explosion.

*Economics: The history of the computer industry clearly indicates a significant potential for long-term cost reductions. Research and development activity currently underway will lay the foundations for these cost reductions.

It is clear that all the necessary components for a solution to a major societal problem are in place. What is needed is vision, concerted planning, discipline management of pilot and evaluation activities. The logical source for support of such activity with its national focus is the federal government.

MISSISSIPPI

G. H. Johnston
State Superintendent of Education

1. Special Education Services

The need for providing services to all children in the state regardless of handicapped conditions is rapidly becoming a major concern. Through the introduction of state legislation, through the passage of federal legislation, and through court suits state officials are being asked to locate all handicapped individuals and to provide an appropriate program for them.

This will be an extremely expensive procedure. Without assistance from the federal level, few states will be able to finance a complete program of services to handicapped persons. This can become an almost impossible situation if pending federal legislation (S. 6)

mandaces states to provide these services without providing the necessary funds.

2. In-service Programs for Teachers

Placing special education students in regular classes during a part of the day will create a widespread need to provide considerable in-service education to the regular classroom teacher. This "mainstreaming" of special education students, combined with the efforts to identify and place all handicapped children in school will frustrate teachers unless they are prepared to cope with this new situation.

3. Moral and Values Education

World and national situations in recent years have created an atmosphere of cynicism among many young people. The view that government is corrupt and that the free enterprise system does not work should be conscientiously combated in our educational programs. Special efforts should be made to replace cynical feelings with the belief in the worth of individual human beings and in democracy as a way of life.

4. Teacher Education and Certification

Who will control teacher education and certification? Several organizations are making efforts to become the controlling influence in teacher education programs and in the certification of teachers. Among these are the U.S. Office of Education, the National Education Association, and the American Federation of Teachers. If the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education is to continue its useful purpose, the various states will need to be aware of the moves that are being made to change the structure of teacher education and certification by the agencies mentioned above. Will the state departments of education

play a major role in determining the outcome of this situation?

The U.S. Office of Education has just recently placed the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education on approved list for one year and is requiring a review at the end of a year to determine if they are complying with criteria established by the U.S. Office of Education for accrediting agencies.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was given one week to make available information required by the Justice Department to determine whether they are in compliance with the U.S. Office of Education standards and criteria.

The Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is experimenting through grants to Child Development Association Consortiums with methods and procedures for credentialing workers in child development centers funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Could this lead to credentialing of elementary teachers? What implications are here for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe curriculum materials as well as teacher certification?

5. The following problems pertain to vocational education.

The perennial problem of late funding of federal programs probably generates more administrative difficulty than any other single thing. The much talked about forward funding would solve this problem. A strong stand by the chief state school officers might be helpful in accomplishing forward funding.

The trend toward passing all federal funding for education and other programs through the governor's office is, to me, one of the most critical problems facing educators concerned with any sort of federal funding. This places educators in a position of having to answer to,

and in many cases, almost beg for the needed funding for the operation of much needed educational programs. A prime example of this is CETA. Perhaps the chief state school officers could urge that educational monies be channeled through departments of education rather than the Department of Labor and gubernatorial appointees.

These are certainly not all the critical problems with federal funding of educational programs, however, they seem to be the most critical at this point.

In our Vocational Rehabilitation Program we are faced with a financial problem in meeting the mandate of recent federal legislation pertaining to Vocational Rehabilitation services. Public Law 93-112, 93rd Congress, H.R. 8070, known as the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, provides that if a State cannot provide services to all eligible handicapped individuals who apply that first priority of service be given those with the most severe handicap. The following is quoted from this legislation:

"Section 101(a) For each fiscal year in which a State desires to participate in programs under this title, a State shall submit to the Secretary for his approval an annual plan for vocational rehabilitation services which shall--

"5(A) contain the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the State plan and in its administration and supervision, including a description of the method to be used to expand and improve services to handicapped individuals with the most severe handicaps; and, in the event that vocational rehabilitation services cannot be provided to all eligible handicapped individuals who apply for such services, show (i) the order to be followed in selecting individuals to whom vocational rehabilitation services will be provided, and

(ii) the outcomes and service goals, and the time within they may be achieved, for the rehabilitation of such individuals, which order of selection for the provision of vocational rehabilitation services shall be determined on the basis of serving first those individuals with the most severe handicaps and shall be consistent with priorities in such order of selection so determined, and outcome and service goals for serving handicapped individuals, established in regulations prescribed by the Secretary; and

"(B) provide satisfactory assurances to the Secretary that the State has studied and considered a broad variety of means for providing services to individuals with the most severe handicaps;"

I agree with this provision of the legislation but these cases will require long and expensive services and will require many more counselor man-hours per case. A recent study of case service cost in our State showed that the average cost of serving the severely disabled was $712 as compared to $372 for the non-severely disabled. The average time required for rehabilitation services to the severely disabled was 24 months and 17.5 months for the non-severely disabled.

Unless Congress substantially increases appropriations to states for rehabilitation purposes, the level of production in terms of number rehabilitated will be much lower than we have had for the past few years.

MISSOURI

Arthur L. Mallory
State Commissioner of Education

This is a report of current issues and problems in education which have been identified as being of major importance. The issues range from

local to national in scope, and represent the diverse points of view of many people and groups.

The first part of the paper, entitled "Responses to Survey on Educational Issues," summarizes in tabular form results of a questionnaire survey of staff members of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The table lists the issues which were named and indicates the agencies which, according to the respondents, have a major responsibility for dealing with each issue. In the table, for example, "Parent and Community Involvement" is shown as being the most frequently stated issue, comprising 10.7 percent of total responses. Eighteen respondents believed this to be a major responsibility of the community or of groups within the community; five believed it to be an important part of the role of the school staff; and three associated the issue primarily with the local board of education. The table includes data from twenty-nine respondents.

The second part is a collection of summary statements of materials on educational issues from writers from around the nation. The content of the articles summarized varies widely with the varying perspectives of the authors. Seven articles are included.

(Text continues on page 177)

RESPONSES TO SURVEY ON EDUCATIONAL ISSUES
(Based on 29 DESE Respondents)

The issues named by the respondents in the left column is in order of decreasing frequency. The number in each cell indicates the number of respondents who associated each issue with each of the legislative or administrative agencies.

Issue	Local			State			National			% of Total Responses
	School Staff	Board of Educ.	Community Groups	DESE	State Board	Legislature	HEW or USOE	Congress	National Groups	
Parent and community involvement	5	3	18							10.7
Curriculum improvement	13	3		5						8.7
Adequate and equitable financing		4	5	2		5	4			8.2
Equitable financing		3	1	3	2	7	3			7.8
Quality of educational services	7		4	6						7.0
Simplification of program administration				3		1	12			6.6
Educational priorities and goals		6		3	2			4		6.2
Community and public attitudes and awareness	1	1	5						3	4.1
Staff retention and morale	3	1		1	3					3.3
Student discipline	6	1								2.9
Desegregation and Equal Rights		1				2	3		1	2.9
Determination of local policies		7								2.9
Programs for handicapped students	2	2		1				2		2.9
Policies-state level					7					2.9

RESPONSES TO SURVEY ON EDUCATIONAL ISSUES (Cont.)

Issue	Local			State			National			% of Total Responses
	School Staff	Board of Educ.	Community Groups	DESE	State Board	Legislature	HEW or USOE	Congress	National Groups	
Educational Research and Dissemination	1			2			4			2.9
Collective bargaining and teacher negotiations		3			1	2			1	2.9
Equal educational opportunities				1		1	4	1		2.9
In-Service Teacher Training	3			3						2.5
Staff evaluation	2	2								1.6
Assessment and Evaluation	1			1	2					1.6
Teacher certification					2	1				1.2
Equitable property assessment						3				1.2
Technical Assistance to SEA's							3			1.2
Urban education problems						2				0.8
District Reorganization					1	1				0.8
School Classification Standards				2						0.8
Inter-Agency Cooperation								2		0.8
Individual Student Differences	2									0.8
Consistency in district operations					1					0.4
pil Transportation Formula					1					0.4

RESPONSES TO SURVEY ON EDUCATIONAL ISSUES (Cont.)

Issues	Local			State			National			% of Total Responses
	School Staff	Board of Educ.	Community Groups	DESE	State Board	Legislature	HEW or USOE	Congress	National Groups	
Participation of non-public school students							1			0.4
Teacher Education									1	0.4
Vocational Education Opportunities		1								0.4

TIME FOR CRYSTAL-GAZING - LET'S TRY 1985 (#1)

Several ideas on the nature of education as of 1985:

Educational Missions - continued indecision about mission of education; less emphasis on transmitting the cultural heritage; curricula in which activities will be related to a mission rather than to subject-matter areas.

Educational Programs - almost universal nursery education; more lifetime learning opportunities; job placement services in schools; standard for termination of formal schooling at grade 14 rather than 12.

Educational Strategies - increased professional preparation for teachers; greater flexibility in school scheduling; more computer-assisted and programmed instruction; more learning at home by use of electronic equipment.

Roles and Relationships - more and better use of paraprofessionals; more administrators and supervisors, with changed roles; larger and more efficient school districts.

EDUCATION U.S.A. (NOVEMBER 25, 1975) (#2)

The National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) contends that: The public has lost control of public schools, while teacher organizations are gaining in power. The article goes on to describe increasing teacher power as one of the major new problems in education. The seriousness of the problem varies with geographic region.

EDUCATION U.S.A. (SEPTEMBER 9, 1974) (#3)

A recent edition of the Journal of Research and Development in Education (Vol. 7, No. 4) proposes that existing forms of education may be made obsolete by increasing opportunities for "lifelong learning:" A shift is predicted in the purpose of education from preparing the learner for a "static society" to "learning how to learn."

EDUCATION U.S.A. WASHINGTON MONITOR (OCTOBER 7, 1974) (#4)

A study commissioned by USOE and conducted by several task force groups on ways to improve American education has produced these rather disparate views:

1. "Increased state leadership is needed because 'relatively little has been accomplished at the local level' as a result of increased Washington interference."
2. "Evidence abounds that education is doing more to its victims than it is doing for its owners (the public)."
3. "The first priority is to provide better management and leadership training for top administrators."
4. "Under the circumstances, teachers do an excellent job of educating students."
5. "Better teacher preparation by colleges is the key to improved education."
6. "The day when teachers are trained by higher education alone is past."

PUBLIC AFFAIRS REPORT, JUNE 1974 (#5)

This paper describes the public's loss of control of the public schools as one of the major educational issues. The development of public education is traced through the 1960's when according to the author, public control was virtually lost. He then notes two experiments designed to restore, in some degree, public control of the schools. The two experiments are the voucher system experiment in California and the School Site Governance project in Florida.

MACMILLAN NEWS, OCTOBER 1974 (#6)

This paper summarizes the contents of Education Yearbook 1974-75, which gives an overview of important trends and developments in education during the past year. The complete table of contents, listing 52 topical articles, is included.

REMARKS ON FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, MARTIN BURLINGAME, NIE (#7)

The author identifies the "greatest controversies of modern American education" as the power of teachers to control their own professional standards; the organizational power of teachers to control their level of economic well-being; and the struggle to insure cost-effectiveness in education. Political implications of these controversies are discussed.

NEBRASKA

Anne Campbell
State Commissioner of Education

Education issues in Nebraska differ little from the educational issues prevalent across the country. Perhaps the order of priority may differ.

School finance with the equity factor plagues the State. The sheltered taxpayer bounded by school district lines is submerged by the facade of "local control," of individualized attention, and of a quasi-open classroom situation. The battle of the powers who must pay from the money sources of income versus sales versus property taxes have resisted to this point any attempt to face the question of equity. Finance and school district organization go hand in hand. The writer is convinced that a reward or incentive for a reasonable organizational structure will need to be devised. Some recent research and development in school finance reform that incorporates income with property has promise. Additional study must be given to resistance for pluralistic educational opportunities using the guise of exorbitant income/sales

taxes. The latter tends to surface around urban areas.

The severe finance issue has been with Nebraska for many years, but the sudden influx of students, the high expectations of education, the retention of students, not only through elementary/secondary education, but into college, has made education visible and vulnerable to overt political attention.

An observation of the point above is that the structure of governance in education is also due for some consideration. What roles are local school boards, state boards of education, and even lay committees for private and parochial schools to have? The legal relationships between state departments and local districts is clouded, and both are under duress. The very fabric of local student needs through educational opportunities are certainly not immune from the "general welfare" debate of continued political surveillance.

Education for the handicapped continues to present some difficulties with logistics, sparsity, transportation, and the multiplicity of local units, as well as the tendency for decentralization and non-residential care. The creatio of yet another Advisory Committee approved by the Governor appears to present a double-barrelled shotgun approach--control of programs by appointed bodies, with the executive's constitutional responsibility for the budgetary function for the agencies who must carry out the programs, in addition the appointive-administrative responsibility in state planning and programming--Where is freedom and how close is what, how and who in education. As the public school systems become loaded with their responsibilities, one wonders about the future of a unique nation-serving mass educational effort which may collapse of its own weight.

Collective bargaining in education gives rise to a vision of educational technicians under the direction of corporate executives with Boards of Directors selected in another manner than elected by the people. Yet the educators,

"educationists," have a right to be people too. Their strength has to be in organization. With ever increasing in-service training, greater experience, most educators have become very fine specialists. Perhaps the medical model of the teaming of specialists will really become the practice.

Inundation of data tends to be the fate of schools--so much is gathered that the gatherers' ratio to faculty is greater than the faculty/student ratio. Reports, surveys, objectives, goals--the accountability/information system appears to provide more employment than service.

Every critical issue in the social arena is delegated to the schools to solve or at least to contribute toward its solution. Adult education seems to be beamed toward avocation, personal enjoyment, seasoned by learning to do what you are doing better, but not much in using the adult intellect in addressing social issues. For this group survival and self-satisfaction are the goals. Yet is has to be the adults of today who solve today's problems. Opinions, not knowledge, prevail.

This epistle has been contradictive and satirical, but perhaps the words convey the perpetual faith that educational leaders hold--that education can be improved, that it has a responsibility for all of the children, that its fault has been that it has been successful.

Education concerns needing attention in Nebraska are:

1. School finance and school district organization.
2. Refinement of lines of authority in education.
3. Coordination of services to children to avoid duplication and to assure needs are being met--education's role in early childhood education.
4. Continued emphasis on cultural awareness, bilingual education.
5. Neglect of the arts in educational priorities.

6. Parenting education and parent involvement in education.
7. Coordination of education and training for vocational pursuits--a hodgepodge removed from unbiased evaluation.

The above item is listed separate from but is a corollary to

8. Coordinating of postsecondary education.
9. Education for the handicapped will need continued attention. The Federal role may well be to provide the cost differential.
10. Planning and development of education extension services from the State Department of Education--not extension courses, but the education agent concept.
11. The volume of reports, surveys, and other information/data gathering activities.
12. Last but not least, a concern for education's role in values and ethics. Citizenship as it is conceived is cognitive, not affective.

NEVADA

Kenneth H. Hansen
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

The following critical issues and problems are listed in no order of priority or importance. Each one of them is of the highest order of priority and importance in one context or another, to one special-interest group or another, or in connection with one or another of several of the major goals of education. However, taken together they become both individually and collectively critical issues and problems.

Although these issues and problems are identified and discussed briefly within the context of the educational system of a particular state, they are in many ways also nationwide problems. We quite rightly insist on reiterating the uniqueness of states, the differences that we identify and

cherish in the 56 state and extra-territorial systems. Nevertheless, the commonalities are sometimes even more significant than the differences. This we may find to be true as we discuss the critical issues and problems in the educational system of a single state, but also look at the implications for national concerns and federal educational efforts.

Issue #1: How can we fill the gaps in our educational system? Our schools generally do a fair-to-middling job for the student who has no special problems. He will probably make it in school and in life without a great deal of extra help from us--perhaps, in fact, almost despite what we do or don't do. But the student with special problems--the disadvantaged, the handicapped, the one from a non-English speaking home, the slow learner or underachiever, the unmotivated. These are the ones for whom we try to develop special supplementary or compensatory programs.

One problem is that these programs have proliferated in response to so many special identified needs that at both the state and federal levels the categories threaten to overwhelm us and to fractionalize the educational program beyond any reasonable possibility of its remaining manageable.

We can't do away with categories and categorical aid without running a risk of ignoring identified needs and established priorities. Perhaps we have to search for and identify just a few broad areas and support these with what have been called "functional block grants." For example, would it be possible at all to group special aid programs, both at state and federal levels, into perhaps only three categories: those programs which are fundamental to all--the basic skills; those programs which are supplementary or compensatory for students with special needs; and those very few which are on the cutting edge and really deserve the appelation "innovative."

It seems impossible that we will ever be able to fill the gaps in our educational system simply by plugging the loopholes one at a time.

Issue #2: How can we reduce the exponential escalation of educational costs? Many of us have been involved for years or even decades in the development of "finance plans," maintaining that the primary needs of education are for greater support and greater equality and equity both in the taxing and distribution formulas.

By no definition whatsoever could I be labeled a fiscal conservative in education, but I am beginning to doubt very seriously that we can maintain any reasonable degree of public support unless there can be more substantial reductions in the rate of growth of educational cost. I realize that none of the cost-savings techniques that have been tried over a period of many years have been satisfactory at all, and I do not have any specific suggestion for what to try next--but I'm simply not ready to give up and admit that there is nothing we can do about the rate of cost escalation in education.

Issue #3: Can we reduce the number of taxing units in education with as much success as we have had in reducing the number of administrative units? In the past two or three decades, we have had remarkable success in many states and dramatic success nationwide in reducing the number of administrative units in education, now standing at about 17,000 local districts.

Without going the uncertain and perhaps perilous route of full state funding, would it be possible to gain acceptance of the idea that taxing units in education need no more be coterminous with administrative units than the latter need be coterminous with attendance units? We have been successful in selling the idea that where students go to school in an attendance unit has little to do with where that unit is administered on a broader base; can we not also sell the idea that where a unit of the educational system is administered should not limit our concept of the broader base which could be taxed for the educational purpose of supporting both the administrative and the attendance unit?

Issue #4: Can we work our way out of the collective bargaining morass? Collective bargaining has assuredly increased the economic welfare of teachers, but its educational side-effects seem to have been more negative than positive. In the view of most local administrators with whom I speak, collective bargaining takes more time, money, and psychic energy than its importance to education itself would seem to warrant. Furthermore, it is more than an idle speculation to believe that the ultimate effect of bargaining could remove fundamental educational decision-making not only from administrators but from lay-elected local school boards.

The implications of these problems for administrative or legislative changes or initiatives at either the state level or the federal level are not clear. Federal legislation in this field would not appear to me on the surface of things to be the answer but perhaps a relatively impartial group such as the Chiefs or the USOE could do a thorough study of this issue.

Issue #5: How can we revitalize inservice education of teachers and administrators? Although state education agencies in general do have at least some titular control over preservice teacher education, the real problems today are in the area of inservice education of teachers and administrators. It is at the inservice level that the best techniques of effective change strategies in education can be worked out. Some state agencies have apparently done an excellent job in making inservice education something more than a routine needed to retain certification or to become recertified. Would it not be possible that a great deal more of the state and federal efforts should be directed toward inservice education of both teachers and administrators even if it means foregoing some direct support of other programs? Although devoting substantial amounts of money to a priority such as this which would not have very great popular support either among the general public or among many school people, might seem to be a pretty risky business, perhaps there needs to be

courage enough to give it a very serious try.

Issue #6: How can we improve state-level governance of education? The USOE-supported study by Roald Campbell and others, along with similar studies over the past decade or two, make it quite clear that state-level governance of education is far from satisfactory. SEA's, it has long been noted, do not have a readily identifiable or strongly supportive clientele. State boards of education, with some notable exceptions, do not seem to be a very effective vehicle for establishing statewide educational policy. Even the nomenclature "state board" is misleading, for these bodies really do not have the legislative or fiscal powers of local boards of education and yet are often confused in their own minds and in the public mind with local boards of education. Perhaps we need to look at a new nomenclature for describing the governance system.

Could a consortium of states or the USOE itself see where we could go beyond the studies that have been made of the status of state governance into some new and positive suggestions for improvement?

Issue #7: Can we establish some organization, agency, or group that has the SEA as its primary concern? The Chiefs are well organized as the Council of Chief State School OFficers; the state boards of education have their own organization; the Education Commission of the States has its primary focus on the interrelationship between the political and educational decision makers in each of the member states. Nobody seem to be primarily interested in state education agencies as such.

Three or four years ago I proposed both to some foundations and to the USOE a "Center for State Studies" which might be set up somewhere to concentrate on the concerns of the agencies themselves--not their chiefs, not their board members, not the political/educational decision makers. This would not be a selfish interest: we keep saying that the state is the primary agency of

government and that state agencies should be strengthened. Particularly with the impending loss of much of what we have known as "Title V," wouldn't now be the time to attempt to get some sort of organization together that could focus on the needs of state agencies, serve as an informational clearinghouse, and correlate state studies so that each state would not have to go its own way without knowing what had already been done and discovered?

Summary

This assignment has been difficult, and I find myself--as I so often do--unequal to the task. Much of what has been said turns out to be obvious, and ready suggestions for specific administrative or legislative changes or initiatives, as the assignment described them, do not seem to emerge easily.

Nevertheless, perhaps this (coupled with half-a-hundred other similar papers) may provide both the states and the USOE with some indications of problems that are nearly universal and some suggestions for improvements that might be wrought.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Newell J. Paire
State Commissioner of Education

This paper identifies critical educational issues facing New Hampshire. The first section of the report identifies issues which are currently critical dividing these into three categories - output issues, input issues and process issues. The output issues identify areas which have been identified as being critical concerns related to student capabilities. The input section identifies areas which must be addressed related to obtaining the necessary educational resources. The process section identifies critical issues in the procedures we use to educate children.

The second section of the report briefly identifies issues which are not yet critical but may become critical in the not far distant future.

1. CURRENT PROBLEMS

Outputs:

Four critical areas have been identified in which substantial numbers of New Hampshire citizens and educators feel the school must bring about program improvement. Student competencies must be improved in the areas of reading and mathematics, vocational skills and career awareness skills. This same survey identified a major segment of our educational population which was being inadequately served -- the handicapped youth and adult.

The State Board recently added a sixth priority area -- energy.

Inputs:

If program improvement is to be made in these areas, significant improvement must be made in the financing of education. A recent report in the State of Connecticut commented, "Under its system of finance, Connecticut education is, as one expert has put it 'facing the problems of the seventies with a turn-of-the-century formula'." In New Hampshire, one would have to debate which century we were turning. Consistently over the past five years New Hampshire has ranked last in the nation in its state aid to education. Our foundation aid program -- designed to equalize expenditures among districts will in 1975-1976 provide 6.1% of the amount of money required if full funding were provided. While 123 school districts in the State are theoretically entitled to foundation aid, only 52 districts will actually receive aid. Given the political realities of the State, it is extremely doubtful that the near future will see a solution to this financing problem.

A second input problem lies in the area of school reorganization.

During the past 10 years, New Hampshire has made excellent progress in the reorganization of our small school districts. Many of those

districts, which were psychologically prepared for reorganization and were physically located in areas where reorganization was sensible, have reorganized. The bringing of improved educational services to the children still living in areas of inadequate service will be increasingly difficult and will require our adopting creative approaches. At the same time, our Southern districts are faced with the problems attendant upon becoming part of the megopolis. Two of our Southern counties are among the fastest growing counties in the United States. These districts require sophisticated services which are currently available only by contract with University personnel. The reorganization of these districts into loose federations for supplementary services will be an important task in the next five years.

A third input problem lies in the area of vocational education. During the past ten years, we have made gigantic progress in the providing of vocational training at the post-secondary level. At the present time, close to 90% of our student population can obtain post-secondary vocational training within comfortable commuting distance of their homes. We must now focus our attention upon improving programs at the secondary school level hopefully coordinating these programs with the existing post-secondary programs. We have committed ourselves to the development of twenty regional vocational centers at the high school level.

Process:

If students are to improve their performance in the areas previously discussed, we cannot rely on making improvements only in the areas of input mentioned. We must address ourselves to the actual process of instruction. To that end, New Hampshire has embarked upon a bold modification of its teacher recertification program. Our plan calls for recertification of personnel be based on the educators completing a program

of self-development which is tied to the needs of the local district. Although we have completed the first cycle of this process, we anticipate expending considerable time and energy in the next two years helping districts improve their skills in implementing this program.

For the past three years, the New Hampshire State Department of Education has been working with laymen and educators to develop an accountability plan for education. Excellent progress has been made in developing commitment to this plan on the part of the New Hampshire Education Association, the New Hampshire School Boards Association, the Elementary and Secondary Principals Association and the Superintendents Association. We anticipate pilot testing our program in three school districts during the next three years to uncover problems which need to be solved. We believe that the implementation of an accountability plan must be based on a realistic appraisal of the current level of skill on the part of those required to implement the system, and be implemented in a manner that will allow addressing the legitimate concerns of the various groups who will be involved with the process.

Associated with the accountability process is the need to assist the department itself and local school districts in various aspects of long range planning. At the present time, very few educators have developed these skills and even fewer have organized their work in a manner that allows them time to engage in systematic planning. Within the State Department of Education, major effort in this area has been to implement the needs assessment in a manner that will produce hard data identifying critical education needs -- but to do so in a manner that will produce an emotional commitment to action on the part of those who must produce action plans designed to correct the deficiencies identified

II. LONG TERM PROBLEMS

Over the long term a number of problems, not now serious in their intensity, have the potential for becoming serious problems.

1. Changes in population characteristics -- for many generations, New Hampshire has been a state with extremely slow shifts in population. This is clearly no longer the case. During the next 25 years, much, if not all , of New Hampshire will undergo serious changes in population both in terms of numbers and characteristics. The population shift is already apparent -- the lower one-third of the state is rapidly becoming part of the megopolis. This shift tends to hide the second major change in the increase in the percent of population outside the normal school attendance age. The schools of the state will gradually find an increase in the demand for adult community education programs with a dramatic increase in the need for new career and post retirement education programs.

   A third change in population is the expected dramatic increase in the Hispanic population in the state. Preliminary signs are present which suggest Nashua -- Manchester will see a dramatic rise in this population in the next ten years.

2. Decreasing revenue available for education -- as the number of children in school decrease the ability of schools to capture scarce dollars will decrease more rapidly than the population decrease unless the schools begin to serve the adult population. This will require the development of community education programs of specialized vocational programs with an emphasis upon skill development for adults moving from one career field to another and of post retirement and enrichment programs.

3. Decrease in content related courses -- with the continuation of the knowledge explosion and the improvement in the electronic transfer of information, the schools of New Hampshire in the future will show a considerable decrease in time spent in low order content development

and a dramatic increase in training students in synthesis and evaluation skills and in skill development in the affective domain. This will require massive retraining, particularly of teachers above the elementary school level and will result in considerable conflict between the values of the adult generation and the schools. The cry -- "the schools don't teach the basics," will become an uproar unless educators become more skillful in involving and explaining the changes which have occurred.

4. De-schooling of education -- along with the decrease in content training will come a movement of education out of school buildings into far more diversified sites -- homes, churches, store fronts, the outdoors will become the common locations for learning.
5. De-professionalization of education -- the professional educator will become the diagnostician and prescriber of educational programs with the learner then moving to selected sites manned by practitioners for actual skill training.

While New Hampshire has not experienced problems that have faced many of the states such as the problems of migratory workers, integration and busing problems, the Indian problem and large influx of racial groups, nevertheless, as described previously, we are constantly facing the issues of appropriate financial support; curriculum reorganization; the need for placing emphasis on the energy crisis; development of alternative educational programs that will appropriately deal with our handicapped population, as well as other issues that are common to the nation.

We are constantly involved in communicating our concerns to the Executive branch of Government, the legislature and the general populace of the state.

NORTH CAROLINA

A. Craig Phillips
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

In North Carolina several critical educational issues and problems demand dynamic resolution. Fortunately, many segments of society recognize this fact; yet one of the continuing problems facing the State is that significant numbers among the State's leadership seem not to share this view. Though "crisis" is a relative term, certain of the educational issues and problems in North Carolina are approaching the crisis level. For the Chinese, their two symbols for the concept of crisis suggest "dangerous opportunity." Acceptance of this Far Eastern connotation of "crisis" would suggest that the State's most critical educational issues and problems, in reality, afford its citizens, especially its leadership at all levels, the challenging opportunity to overcome the barriers to educational change which too long have been either unrecognized, misunderstood, accepted, or half-heartedly tackled.

Shared Accountability

Accountability is more than a currently fashionable concept in North Carolina; increasingly it is becoming the focus of statewide attention. In the State Agency, for example, determined efforts toward implementing the concept of shared responsibility is, at present, the major goal of the State Superintendent and his staff, especially in view of major financial requests which, for budgetary and political reasons, were slashed from the 1975-77 educational budget by the 1975 Legislature. Prior to this drastic action, and particularly during recent years when the State Agency has participated in a regional project (Mid-Atlantic Interstate Project) on "accountability," concentrated emphasis has been placed on the "acceptance of responsibility for the continuing improvement of the teaching-learning process and its results." In essence, this is educational accountability. Or, as Leon Lessinger states,

"Accountability in education is, among other things, an attempt to build responsibility into the system so that it cannot be avoided."

The nature of accountability--its purposes, its possibilities, and how it might best serve the overall objectives of education--should be understood by all those individuals and agencies whom it affects and particularly by those responsible for its utilization. Among such individuals and agencies would be: the Governor, legislators, the State Superintendent, the State Board of Education, Commissioners, local boards and committees, local administrators, teachers, parents, other taxpayers, as well as students themselves. Such a statement suggests the necessity for cooperative study and determination, first of all, of the place of accountability in the total program of education and for joint responsibility in guaranteeing maximum use of resources, maximum student achievement, plus an honest evaluation and reporting of what is learned.

In North Carolina, it is felt that emphasis on shared responsibility for continuing improvement in education must be strengthened at every level within the State and that authentic, cooperative identification of individual roles in a well-planned, well-coordinated total plan must be determined. Without agreement on the significance of such determination, accountability as a realistic approach to fulfillment is all but impossible. Since accountability touches every phase of the total educational program, any sincere effort to implement the concept would afford all those concerned their most significant opportunity for improving the total process of growth and development.

Shared responsibility for assessing needs, for establishing goals, for developing programs for the achievement of goals, for the evaluation of efforts undertaken, for the accurate reporting of results, and for the recycling of feedback into the total process gives promise of creative commitment on the part of all those concerned with the ongoing improvement of education--administrators, governing boards, legislatures, members of the business and

industrial community, parents, state education agencies, students, and teachers.

It is recognized that any effective program of accountability must be continuous. What is learned about needs assessment; planning; the formulation of objectives; management; teaching methods; utilization of time, talents, materials, facilities; and evaluation--all this information must be thrown into the intellectual, give-and-take hopper for recycling, as it were--for renewed assessment of needs, goals, and strategies; for renewed planning and programming; and for refined, more meaningful evaluation.

Intensified interest in accountability, partially the result of dissatisfaction with educational results, has the very real possibility of increased involvement and commitment for better education.

Governance

Equally as important as the need for a more reliable type of shared accountability throughout the State is the urgent need for further clarification relative to governance. Particular attention was focused on this controversial area during the past session (1975) of the General Assembly, though certain aspects of governance have frequently been studied as ways of improving education have been considered.

The growing dilemma in the area of governance of public education poses in North Carolina such questions as these:

Should the Chief State School Officer be appointed or elected?

If appointed, by whom? The Governor? The State Board of Education?

What should be the role and function of the State Board of Education?

To what degree and in what areas should legislative mandates be deemed appropriate as means of strengthening education?

To what degree is citizen input relative to the goals of public education desirable? How best can such input become available and how best utilized?

What part should citizens participation play in the affairs of public education as related to the support of public education?

To what degree should minority input be encouraged and utilized in the sensitive area of changing urban school districts?

Who, in actuality, is responsible for accountability in the public schools? To what degree should accountability be an indigenous process?

In this broad area of governance, subtle and not-so-subtle encroachments are being made into areas of responsibility once considered more or less sacrosanct by individuals, groups, and agencies. To what degree is this appropriate, or even legal, in some instances? How should the problems be faced? For example, there seems to be a widespread tendency for Boards of education to move beyond the policy-making function and become directly involved in administration and management. Legislative bodies are tending to move into areas of curriculum and management through legislative acts and the creation of their own appendages to engage in study and monitoring. Through collective bargaining and teacher associations, teachers are demanding a greater voice and increased power in decision-making.

Governance of another variety relates to the control exercised through federal funding plans which permit expenditures only for specific student categories. Directly or indirectly such plans promote segregation of student groups for special instructional programs and activities, a practice which is both divisive and inefficient and which has negative effects on all students.

As a result of what is taking place in governance, it is neither foolhardy nor inappropriate to ask bluntly, "Who controls the schools?" Is it educators? students? local citizens? the general public? special interest groups? State Government? the Federal Government? governmental agencies? A more appropriate question is, of course, "In terms of productive, meaningful results for individuals and communities, how best should all aspects of the total educational program be conceived, organized, coordinated, administered, and evaluated? Efforts to achieve the goal implied in this question would, of

necessity, give emphasis to the positive aspects of governance and make mandatory a type of shared accountability which the State needs to stress more and more.

Goals and Objectives

The purpose of educational goals is to indicate the direction in which schools should be moving. Basically, then, one might say that goals are statements of preferences, choices, and values. By and large, overall goals evolve; they are not discovered. Goals, for example, most frequently evolve in forms of social and economic philosophy and in terms of ethical values. Appropriate implementing objectives usually follow. In reality, educational goals constitute a form of policy; they imply a program of social action based on accepted values. And, since values change, educational purpose, of necessity, must change. Though certain "eternal verities" continue to be stressed among educational goals, new emphases, as is appropriate, also continue to find their places in well-conceived statements of aims, goals, and philosophy. "It should be obvious that until some reasonably firm consensus regarding what society expects from the educational system has been achieved, no systematic improvements are likely to occur."

In recent years content and process goals have been clearly differentiated by the Kettering Foundation, each constellation which has its own positive features. According to the Kettering Commission, content goals are the general skills that students must acquire if they are to function at a level that is both personally and socially rewarding. Here much emphasis is frequently placed on course, term papers, examinations, marks, credits, rigidity, and conformity. On the other hand, process goals are the individual abilities and attitudes which are influenced by procedures, environment, and activities of the School. In this area stress is often placed on creativity, critical thinking, independent effort, self-discipline, questioning, responsibility,

and self-realization.

Commitment to the realization of goals lies, for the most part, in the broad, active participation of many in determining goals. It should never be assumed, for example, that educators should have sole prerogative for identifying goals. Just as important, plain citizens--parents, other lay people, as well as members of business and industry--should be heard from. And, of course, students and consultants. Nothing is more important than the fact that educational goals should be cooperatively formulated.

Goals for students, it seems, should emphasize those for intellectual, personal, and social development. More important than acceptance of such a statement, however, would be the ultimate determination of priorities among goals by those closest to students.

Such idealistic ideas do not lessen the frustrating problems that continue to exist in this vital area.

To what degree should schools be instruments for effecting social change?

To what degree should schools attempt to solve the ills of society? Impersonalization of the individual? Watergate-type activities? Loss of confidence in government? Widespread graft? Changing moral values? Breakdowns in institutions?

Is it reasonable to expect the schools to deal with such problems in a reasonable, practical manner?

To what degree should goals consistently reflect the new type of student which populates the schools? In what ways can students most effectively assist in determining goals?

Should a major goal of the school as an institution be that of developing a sensitivity among youth relative to changes that seem to be desired as well as ways of accomplishing these changes?

To what degree should goals relative to equal educational opportunities, compensatory education, pluralism, elimination of sex discrimination, and others equally sensitive and controversial be re-examined and modified in terms of findings available relative to their implementation up to now?

To what degree should current goals pertaining to improving education in urban areas be re-appraised and modified in terms of the many problems still concentrated in these areas?

What are the best approaches for resolving basic differences of opinion and philosophy among the State's top leadership in government, education, industry, and the like?

Where, finally, should major emphasis be placed in the area of goals? On social engineering? Civic responsibility? Coping with change? Shaping change? Equal opportunities for all children and youth?

The Curriculum or What Should be Taught?

Concepts of the curriculum as a fixed body of knowledge, as well-defined courses, or as identical learning experiences for all children and youth are incompatible with practically all verbalized goals and objectives. Moreover, recent emphasis on individualized instruction (instruction which is meaningful to the individual) forbids conformity and encourages cooperative tailor-made programs which fit specific students. In essence, therefore, approaches must be discovered and devised--and on a continuing basis--to accommodate what individual students at any particular time. Whatever students experience is the curriculum.

Determining what is worth knowing should be regarded as the continuing responsibility of administrators, teachers, students, and others who have the right and the responsibility for being involved in educational decision-making. Realizing that knowledge is not static, that truth does not remain the same, that opportunities and ambitions change, and that the differences in students demand differentiated learning experiences reinforces the concept of continuing and cooperative determination of that which is worth knowing, not only in terms of groups but in terms of individuals also.

Curricula of the future, it seems, should evolve from the best that is known about changes in society, the needs of individuals, and the successes and limitations of past educational programs. Inherently this suggests increased flexibility and wide expansion of individual curricula, with less emphasis on hours, credits, units, and the like than heretofore.

Keeping that which has genuine merit; discarding the worthless as an

ongoing process; telescoping certain areas into shorter periods of learning; updating emphases; stressing the interdisciplinary approach to learning as a means of lessening fragmentation and duplication; and recognizing what constitutes the total learning environment should contribute much in next few years toward a revitalization of curricular content. The fact that process is also content in the broad interpretation of learning suggests still another dimension for growth.

Though North Carolina is headed in this general direction in a number of its schools, the problem of what should be taught remains as a compelling issue, confusing and dividing many well-meaning and splendid citizens throughout the State. Such questions as the following are significant:

What specifics should be included in the curriculum? How should these be organized?

Who has the right and responsibiltiy for determining this? Educators? At what level? Local Boards of Education? The State Board of Education? Parents? Students? Consultants in institutions of higher learning? In business and industry?

To what degree should modification of the curriculum be a continuing process?

What criteria might be useful in determining whether curricula are meeting the needs of individuals? Of society?

In what ways should earlier maturation affect the curriculum?

What, in reality, are the "basics" in education? Reading? Writing? Arithmetic? Rights? Responsibilities? Wise use of leisure time? Independent thinking? Decision-making? Creative expression of acceptable skills and talents?

What is the role of the curriculum in the latter part of the twentieth century relative to drugs, changing moral values, mass media, the dethronement of standards, and other pertinent and sensitive areas?

How can the needs of minority groups, whether ethnic and/or exceptional be reflected in the curriculum?

When are innovations in the curriculum justified? And who has the responsibility for determining this?

To what degree should preparation for college mold the curriculum?

What emphasis should be placed on job preparation? How flexible can the curriculum be? How flexible should it be?

How can education for quality living replace education for grades, credits, scholarships, and the like?

How can "the public" as a whole come to appreciate individual skill and competence with less emphasis on competition?

Who among us will dare to devise marking systems which reflect the best that is known about the teaching-learning process? And how might this best be done?

How best can the overall effectiveness of the curriculum be measured? To what degree should outside consultants be used?

How best are results of such appraisals disseminated? And what steps should follow this effort?

Financing Education

Though the dilemma of adequately financing the schools might have been discussed first in this paper and though major and continuing attention must be given this all-important area, it is placed at this point since all the concerns presented here deserve priority thinking and constructive action, but primarily because the SEA has committed itself irrevocably at this moment to the implementation of shared responsibility among all levels of the educational spectrum.

It is recognized that substantive changes in the schools of North Carolina will require parallel changes in the financial structure supporting these schools. In 1948, 1959, 1968, and 1972 special studies were made in North Carolina relative to the sources of funds as well as their distribution. All of these studies stress the importance of local initiative, flexibility, and equality of funding. The North Carolina system of public school finances was designed to revive destitute local systems which had experienced financial bankruptcy as a result of the depression of 1929. This system of finance has undergone many changes; but, a system designed to meet the crisis of the depression cannot be expected to provide for the emerging demands of the twenty-first century.

The present methods of financing the schools of North Carolina prohibit imaginative, creative program planning at the local level. Since numerous contraints characterize the manner in which State monies (70 percent of all funds) may be spent, local school units have practically no freedom as to how they may use these funds. For this reason, the State "system" can be blamed for ineffectiveness, where it may exist, than more accountable local officials. If schools in North Carolina are to meet the challenge of educating all children and youth for the life and world that is and that which is to come, contraints of traditional procedures in state fiscal support must, it seems, be removed. Ways, however, must be found for more adequate and effective support. Monetary policies must stimulate growth in excellence of educational opportunities rather than stifle it.

Concerns which are now more acute than at any time in recent history include the following:

> How can the twin problems of diminishing revenue and increased costs best be resolved? What are the possibilities for a joint study group (key government leadership, top educational leaders, layment including the business community, and consultants) in hammering out concrete suggestions for "immediate" implementation?
>
> What approaches seem desirable at this time in trying to eliminate inequities in school financing? Those inherent in the state system? Those resulting from local characteristics?
>
> What shall be the State's educational priorities at a critical time like this? Universal education, even if watered down? Special education groups, such as the disadvantaged, the handicapped, the talented, etc. individualized teaching? Support services? Limited areas with emphasis on quality?
>
> What are the next steps in achieving more effective cooperation in the area of financial support between the SEA and the State Board of Education?
>
> What strategies seem most necessary and/or desirable in securing more federal funds for education? More state support? Additional local responsibility?
>
> How best can the public be apprised of the realities of the State's financial difficulties in the area of finance? And what approaches should be made to enlist the assistance of "men of good will" throughout the State?

A Changing Student Body and Teaching Staff

Today's students and their teachers constitute, to a considerable degree, a totally new breed. Understanding these "species" is essential in order to cooperate in the resolution of their fears and insecurity, their idealism, concomitant bravado and impatient "demands."

The process of understanding and cooperative endeavor, will, it seems, necessitate a knowledge of the changes which so rapidly face us; a realistic acquaintance of what each group is actually like--their needs, interest, ambitions, etc.; a knowledge of how learning best takes place; an appreciation of the nature of change and the necessity for continuing change; acquaintance with the basic skills of inter-personal relationships; the values of cognitive and affective learning; the need for recognizing optional approaches to conventional teaching-learning processes; and an awareness of viable ways for appraising the meaningfulness of learning experiences.

Concerns in this area include among others, the following:

What are some of the most viable approaches for lessening student boredom, a major cause for physical and psychological dropouts?

Are teachers being prepared in far too many instances for a world that has vanished or is rapidly doing so? What can be done about this?

How will developments in the legal field as they relate to student due process, student privacy rights, educational opportunity rights, etc. influence the education process? How best can educators, parents, and students keep abreast of legal information which pertains to them?

How should activism be dealt with? How can teachers best be prepared for their part in this responsibility? Parents?

What are some of the practical and meaningful approaches to alternatives to classroom instruction which many students desire and sometimes "demand?" What implications does this type of situation have on finances, governance, objectives, and the curriculum of the schools?

How can teacher militancy be approached so that teachers and others concerned with educational progress can profit, whether the issue is salaries, class size, fringe benefits, absence in the decision-making processes, or some other area?

Can educational professionalism best be promoted through teacher organizations? Unions? Professional development? How?

LESS DRAMATIC THAN ISSUES -- YET FUNDAMENTAL: ONE EXAMPLE

Fundamental to any resolution of the issues and dilemmas currently characteristic of the North Carolina educational scene is an awareness and an acceptance of other specific realities, often not stressed, specifically those such as the following:

*the necessity for understanding the nature of change and the continuing need for change

* the necessity for appreciating the significance of affective as well as cognitive learning

*the necessity for understanding how learning best takes place and for utilizing what is known in this area at all levels of education.

Since these urgencies are less dramatic and less well appreciated than some others and seemingly less important--except among behavioral psychologists perhaps--it is customary to focus attention on the so-called more "urgent" matters, such as financial problems, for example. Yet, until there is widespread understanding, appreciation, and acceptance of the importance of these areas of widespread neglect, it is not likely that the generally accepted "major" issues of public concern will be resolved. One example will be used. Well-planned, prestigious, and continuing attention, it seems, should be given areas such as these at the national, state, and local level--and over a time span long enough--for productive results to ensue. "Major" issues (so often those about which much clamor demands immediate attention) would, of necessity, be attacked simultaneously.

THE NECESSITY FOR UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF CHANGE AND THE CONTINUING NEED FOR CHANGE

It is increasingly imperative that the process of change be more thoroughly understood among all segments of society, if indeed educational improvements are to parallel the ever-changing interests of children and youth

in a society which itself is changing more rapidly than at any period in the history of civilization. The anatomy of change--including its pressures and their varying intensities, goals which must be considered in view of an ever-developing philosophy, individuals and their readiness for change, psychological effects among those concerned, and approaches to evaluation which might indicate the validity of specific changes--is a complicated matter. This fact, however, need not forbid determined efforts to identify those positive results which might result from the teaching-learning process.

No less than educators themselves, legislators and other laymen alike must appreciate the fact, and act upon it, that in a world which each day is unlike any other which preceded it, in a society whose moves and values are constantly changing--educational patterns also must change, or, more emphatically, must be changed. Haphazard change, revolutionary change, and change by chance do not constitute the answer. Since change is not necessarily synonymous with improvement, it must be justified in terms of its many interrelated facts. One might rightly say, therefore, that one of the main tasks of those concerned with education is that of understanding the nature of change and that of planning for change, without fear of such lables as "innovation," "experimentation," and "change" itself.

Change we are often reminded is the only basis for stability. And, if it is true, as Edmund Burke admonished years ago, that "we preserve by changing," it seems reasonable that change in education should be regarded as an opportunity for more meaningful growth rather than as a challenge to one's personal integrity. Yet, in spite of the high intentions of governmental leaders, educational administrators, teachers, parents, and others, the influence of reform, experimentation, and innovation in recent years has not touched the majority of schools, according to national statistics.

In assuming increased initiate for understanding change and for helping others understand its nature, educators are challenged to keep up-to-date in a number of areas: the rapidly changing society of which all of us are a part; the ever-changing needs of students; the manner in which learning best takes place; what research has to say about motivation and methodology; grouping in light of contemporary findings; what's worth knowing; evaluation; optional approaches to self-fulfillment; as well as trends and promising practices. When educators at all levels are fortified with knowledge and enthusiasm, leadership for change can become a reality.

NORTH DAKOTA

M. F. Peterson
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Embodied herein are identified and discussed the problems and issues of the principal federal-support programs administered and supervised by the North Dakota State Agency for Education--Titles I, II, III, V, and VI-B, C, D, and G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and Title III of the National Defense Education Act.

The paper closes with comments by North Dakota's Chief State School Officer relative to consolidation under Public Law 93-380 and recommendations in general.

TITLE I ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Probably the most important contribution of ESEA was spotlighting the needs of children.

Approximately 20,000 public and 1,000 non-public educationally deprived children, have received supplementary services each year in North Dakota since Title I began in FY 1966.

Nearly all of the eligible school districts are participating with

273 approved programs in the State in FY 1974.

LEA's have concentrated remedial services in reading and mathematics in the lower grades with the greatest concentration being in grades 2, 3, and 4.

Instead of blaming the children for failing to fit the school, ESEA asked the school to fit the child, to assess the particular needs of their students and to devise individualized and effective prescriptions for them. Emphasis is on the individual student in North Dakota and instruction takes place in groups of not over six students and often on a one to one basis.

Special provisions of Title I were targeted at children of migrant workers, neglected youngsters and juvenile delinquents in various types of institutions. Simultaneously, ESEA spotlighted the chronic need for expanded services to handicapped children.

Today our school districts seldom question the need for federal aid. Rather the debate revolves about what kind and how much federal aid to offer and how to best construct a workable federal-state partnership, rather than over the continuity of ESEA itself. Indeed, former opponents of ESEA have come to be numbered among the Acts more constructive critics and co-sponsors. Today, renewal of the Act is never in doubt, as the lopsided 1974 House vote of 380 to 26 demonstrates.

READING RESULTS

The average progress of students in all years in school, except first, have gained an average of at least one grade equivalent. This is equal to at least 33.4% gain over the average rate of gain in prior years.

MATHEMATICS RESULTS

Prior rate of gain for students in the mathematics projects ranged from a low of .40 grade equivalent per year to a high of .75 grade equivalent per year. The average rate of prior gain is .65 grade equivalent per year.

Our test results have been respectable from the very beginning of Title I and with better prepared teachers and greater concentration, the results should improve.

PROBLEMS OF TITLE I

Title I has always been funded for failure. Late funding has resulted in poor planning by the school districts and the loss each year of some of the best trained teachers. They transfer to the regular classroom in order to obtain stability.

Forward funding, before July 1st, is an absolute necessity if Title I is to receive an equal break with other programs.

The target provision prevents the State from serving the most needy children, only the needy in certain areas.

Comparability requirements are too technical and inflexible and do not allow for exceptions in our sparsely populated areas. School districts in North Dakota are not supplanting services through Title I. The time involved in checking, thoroughly, one of our large districts would take at least a week. We do not have the money or staff necessary to check comparability thoroughly.

Administrative funds for Title I have not increased in 10 years, or since the beginning of Title I, while several programs have been added and inflation has been rampant. It will be necessary to cut back on services to the districts and more seriously curtail monitoring which is absolutely essential in order to administer Title I efficiently.

Title I teachers need special training and there is little money available for most school districts to do this.

Federal Directives have required local school districts to concentrate their funds on those Title I eligible students having the greatest need. This leaves large numbers of Title I eligible students unserved and many more children whose parents gross more than $3,000 annually ineligible.

School administrators face uncertainty each year as the Congress and the President determine slowly and heatedly the DHEW - Labor Budget. Yet, the same administrators face the criticism each year that they did not adequately plan their Title I programs.

We are fearful that the new indirect charge regulation will use funds that should go for children. Only 1.87% were used under our State regulations.

It was the intent of Title I to serve the whole child, but very few dollars are being spent on supportive services because of the difficulty of offering them to Title I pupils in our small schools.

North Dakota is capable of allocating Title I funds far more equitably than is now being done with the Federal Formula.

TITLE II ESEA

INTRODUCTION

Title II ESEA is designed for the acquisition of school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials suitable for use by children and teachers in public and non-public elementary and secondary schools.

EVALUATION AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In evaluating the Title II ESEA Programs through school visitations by the Coordinator and other personnel of the Department of Public Instruction, annual library reports and evaluations by school administrators and librarians, the following accomplishments seem evident:

1. All library materials have been improved in quantity as well as quality in our participating local education agencies.
2. We find more and better library media selection tools, particularly in our smaller school systems.
3. The number of books per student has increased considerably as a

result of Title II ESEA.

4. We are finding that the LEA's are getting a better balance between library materials and audio-visual materials.
5. We believe that due to Title II ESEA and the requirements of Title II ESEA, LEA's are striving toward better management of their media centers.
6. In the past four or five years we are getting more qualified librarians in our school districts.
7. Due to the requirements of Title II ESEA relative to the maintenance of effort for libraries, LEA's are budgeting greater amounts for their media centers.
8. We find that in fiscal year 1975 we had between 95-97 percent of all the children in public schools participating in the Title II ESEA Program. This indicates that Title II ESEA has been a popular program in the State of North Dakota.
9. School administrators, librarians, and teachers hoped that the Title II ESEA Program would continue because they felt that this program had done much for the improvement of the instruction of the children in their schools.
10. Administrators and librarians consider Title II ESEA one of the better federal programs due to the minimum red tape involved for participating in the program.
11. We feel that Title II ESEA has been instrumental in getting better cooperation between the private schools and the public schools and has created a better relationship between them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If the Title II ESEA Program would have continued, I would have submitted

the following recommendations:

1. Forward funding for better State and LEA planning.
2. Increase the minimum funding for each school district in the State to no less than $200.
3. To continue to impress upon school administrators and librarians to weed out obsolete instructional materials.

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF TITLE III, ESEA

ACHIEVEMENTS

The Title III, ESEA program in North Dakota has resulted in many achievements along the lines of community involvement, developmental assistance, needs assessment change strategies, management systems, performance objectives, staff development, comprehensive evaluation, cost effectiveness and program auditing.

SHORTCOMINGS

Guidelines for writing annual state plans, together with annual report forms, have frequently arrived after reports were due in Washington. Consequently, approval of the plans and subsequent funding have been delayed. This has caused some problems in program planning and program management. We, however, realize this is not a unique problem to Title III, ESEA. We do wish to state that our relations with the USOE staff have been excellent. They are most cooperative--we realize the constraints under which they operate.

Lack of expertise at the local level in carrying out evaluation of local projects.

More concern should be given for the broad needs of the LEA's over all curriculum areas.

Clearance process for regulations and guidelines should be streamlined.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Local districts need training in needs assessment procedures which would enable them to match these needs with projects which have related proven practices.

Projects should have strong commitments from the local educational community with documented proof that the school community, including the youth, have a chance to be a part of the commitment process.

We need a more viable means of disseminating information to schools thru identifiable programs that would match their needs.

The role and function of the Title 306 Facilitator should be a part of the State Department of Public Instruction in North Dakota rather than a local school district. This office of the Facilitator should be an on-going part of the Department of Public Instruction if we are to effect the change that has been demonstrated.

CONSOLIDATION

The idea of consolidation is not all bad but if the purpose was to simplify the process and provide equality to the states, I feel they have missed the mark. If we stand to lose the amount of money we are purported to lose in 1977, then we have canceled out the Title III program.

TITLE V ESEA

Title V is the heart of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and addresses itself to the purpose of strengthening State Departments of Education. Its objective in strengthening the state educational agency is to stimulate and assist state leadership resources.

Plans include additional personnel to aid in overall supervision and accreditation of elementary schools as well as in secondary schools of the state. Distances are great in North Dakota in relation to the population, which increases the burden of on-site monitoring and supervision. It is physically impossible to accomplish on-site visitation; therefore, workshops and conferences in strategic places are periodically conducted. Title V funds provide the means of these activities.

There is also great need for accurate information relative to schools and education--information about personnel, finance, curriculum, and facilities, for example.

All of this has to do with relationships between the state agency and schools, and surely comes under the huge category of strengthening the State Department.

Title V funds are used to develop new curricula, new study guides, and helps in instructional materials. Title V ESEA has been the most versatile of the federal support programs for education for several reasons. It permits money to be used in different areas, including staff, projects, and curriculum development.

Since the "hold-fast" condition seems to be a part of the regulations under P.L. 93-380, the consolidation will not change appreciably the administration and operation of Title V in North Dakota.

Title V funds provide salaries for over one-half of the personnel in North Dakota's educational agency. Our strong recommendation is that it continue and that the amount of funding be increased to accommodate the inflation impact.

TITLE VI-B EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT

Title VI-B, Education of the Handicapped Act, has been very helpful in providing funds for "growing edge" projects which have demonstrated effective techniques in programming for handicapped children.

Project funds have been available to school districts and county special education boards for initiating and developing programs for handicapped children. A total of 141 such projects have been funded through the State Department of Public Instruction with Title VI-B funds since its inception. All of these 141 projects initiated programs of services to handicapped in schools or areas that were not providing these services. These projects have

been most effective in that over 90% of them were continued with local and state funds after the three years of funding from Title VI-B funds.

We do realize the need for comprehensive planning, accept the changes in priorities as needs are met, and fully accept the minimal funding under Title VI-B as supplemental funding. However, we view as very dangerous to our state, proposed federal legislation contained in S-6 and HR 7217 for funding in Fiscal Year 1977.

We feel Title VI-B funds for the handicapped should remain as supplemental not become a giant funding effort which will abort state and local effort. Educational programs for the handicapped in North Dakota need to be implemented on a planned quality basis. Massive funding directly to school districts on the basis of use it or loose it would not benefit the special education programs being developed in our state.

TITLE VI-C REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER DEVELOPMENT

North Dakota is one of eight states funded through Iowa for regional development of services targeted on identification, evaluation, and planning for individual handicapped children, who have multiple or severe handicaps, and were previously unserved. This program ties in well with the new 1976 amendments to P.L. 93-380, which delineates state responsibility to locate and evaluate every handicapped child in the state.

We have received some technical help from the Iowa headquarters, although they tend toward minute reporting and nose counting. The emphasis of the program on individual programming, however, is especially important in this area of severely handicapped. A special fund is available for diagnosis of children and we are using that.

TITLE VI-D PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

North Dakota has received approximately $60,000 per year in traineeship

and fellowship money since 1959. Currently the amount is $50,000. These funds go to selected graduate trainees (summer sessions) and fellows (full year fellowships) to help meet the demands for personnel in public school programs for handicapped children. These funds have been significant in the past, preparing more than 300 teachers. In addition, the grants to the college or university which accompany each trainee or fellow have helped North Dakota colleges develop their graduate programs.

In addition, inservice special study institutes have provided approximately 4,800 man days of in-depth study which has made a significant difference in program quality.

Now that North Dakota has committed its schools to total programming for handicapped children by 1980, it is in need of greater numbers of qualified people. The traineeships and fellowships have encouraged experienced teachers to return for graduate courses and degrees. The amount of money was reduced to $50,000 at a very unfortunate time. We had requested $100,000 to help with meeting the mandate.

Traineeships and fellowships under Title VI-D have undergirded the development of graduate teacher education in special education, and have provided North Dakota school with significant numbers of persons. We will need a few people in these areas. We are now hurting in the areas where more numbers of graduate level teachers are needed (mentally retarded, specific learning disabilities). We need more dollars for all areas of training.

TITLE VI-G SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

In 1973-1974 and 1974-1975, the Department of Public Instruction participated in a cooperative effort with the University of North Dakota to serve 200 children with specific learning disabilities, and in the process prepare graduate level teachers who would commit at least one year teaching

children with specific learning disabilities in a small school (300-1,000 enrollment) in North Dakota.

This has been an excellent program and has provided small schools with quality personnel. It was very time consuming and because of its heavy emphasis on teacher preparation, we encouraged the University of North Dakota to assume the responsibility of the project in 1975-1976.

TITLE III NDEA - IN RETROSPECT

The federal assistance provided by Title III NDEA, FInancial and Technical, came at a very opportune time in North Dakota. Four years prior to the enactment of P.L. 85-864, the Division of Director of Field Services was established in the Department of Public Instruction. This enabled the Department, for the first time, to assign a person full time to school visitations and counseling. At the inception of Title III NDEA, a visitation report indicating areas of deficiencies and suggestions for improvement had been completed for every school district in the State:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

SPECIAL PROJECTS

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

CURRICULUM MATERIALS

WORKSHOPS AND IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AND U.S.O.E. INSTITUTES

EVALUATION

Pros

-Improved facilities and equipment in LEA's
-Language labs are used effectively and are still being installed in North Dakota.
-Foreign language enrollments increased due to this program and are still developing.
-Schools consistently indicate an improvement of the instructional program as a result of the assistance received under NDEA Title III.

Cons

-Need for more funds.
-We were never able to completely overcome the idea that NDEA Title III is only a science, mathematics, and modern foreign language program.
-The evaluative process for this program was not effectively implemented by the many school districts.
-Support was given to some special projects in which rather sizeable funds were invested in installations and equipment which have not been as beneficial to the teaching-learning

Pros	Cons
-The matching aspect of this program required LEA's to make a commitment and usually resulted in improved selection practices in the acquisition program. -The more important parts of this program included the activities in curriculum development and teacher in-service. -Board members, administrators, and teachers have been nearly unanimous in the support of NDEA because of its flexibility, planning, and local matching requirement.	process as was anticipated. -The direct impact of the program is difficult to identify in pupil achievement in light of the limited funds available for Title III NDEA compared to the total per pupil expenditures.

CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is difficult to understand the action of the past three Administrations to eliminate a program that has practically universal support among school boards, administrators, and our Congressional delegation. It also enjoyed wide support by the North Dakota Legislature when a matching State appropriation was required. Many attributed its success to the matching requirement.

As one of a large group of educators who question the wisdom of Consolidation because of what it will do to accepted and established programs, our anticipation as to the outcome appears justified. The provisions of Title IV of P.L. 93-380, the complexity of the Rules, Regulations, and Guidelines, based upon our experience to date, for all intent and purposes will nullify the basic goals and objectives of Consolidation, namely to "provide that each local education agency will be given complete discretion on how the funds it receives will be divided among the various programs."

A recommendation that the practices and procedures currently in effect for the categorical programs, to the extent possible, be adapted to the administration of the consolidated program would appear to be in order.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

One of the major causes of frustration and discontent on the part of the State Agency, and local educational agencies, too, is the absence of forward-funding, or at least the absence of the certainty of funding and the amount of funding for the various programs. Not knowing when and if funds are coming makes it necessary for us to operate in a vacuum.

In North Dakota we do not check each school relative to federal support programs for the reason the staff and funds are not sufficient. This would be a time-consuming activity, especially in the larger districts. Hence we use the system of spot checking and monitoring. We find that this works very satisfactorily and seems to be effective.

Speaking of Title I ESEA, administrative funds have not been increased in the last ten years while programs have been added, and then, of course, there is inflation. Inflation strikes in every point; consequently, administrative funds should be increased for all federal programs.

We are of the opinion that the utilization of a state formula will make it possible for us to more equitably allocate federal funds than the utilization of the federal formula. In this instance I am thinking of Title I.

A word about Public Law 93-380, which consolidates several of the federal programs: At the same time that consolidation is effected, several new categorical aid programs have been added, so it seems that we have as many categorical programs--in fact, more than we had before. However, I do believe that 93-380 is the step in the right direction, even though federal guidelines are quite stringent.

OHIO

Martin W. Essex
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times....." and it still is. Today's schools are superior to those of any prior time. Today's teachers are better prepared and of higher quality than at any prior time. Unfortunately, the best in history is not adequate for our complex technological society, with its rapid urbanization and depressing anonymity.

This paradox gives rise to a host of educational issues--issues that are nationwide in scope, yet particularly significant for each of the several states. Prompt action is needed to avoid debilitation of our nation's vitality.

Salient educational imperatives for the states and the nation are listed below. While not exhaustive, the items do reflect the magnitude of the work to be done. A brief analysis of each issue and possible solutions are found on the following pages.

INSTITUTIONAL REDESIGN IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Unprecedented social, technological and economic changes--with concomitant shifts in employment markets--have outstripped the capacities of the best teachers and schools ever to cope with the divergent needs of students.

Numerous innovations such as the storefront school and school-without-walls have not blazed the hoped-for trails to serve the emergent learning needs of youth.

Standing at the vortex of the educative process is the individual teacher, whose improved preparation becomes crucial if schools are to be responsibly responsive.

Teacher education historically has been done on the cheap. Remaining at the bottom of the academic pecking order, colleges of education have too frequently been perceived and used as institutional money-makers.

New or modified course patterns for teacher certification are inadequate to break the lock-step bargain basement approach. Fundamental structural redesign of teacher education institutions is imperative.

The explorations associated with the competency-based approach to teacher education do not encompass the necessary structural changes. Rather, it will lead to merit rating.

Merit rating has been unsuccessfully tried in numerous settings over the past several decades and has run amuck. With highly developed teacher and administrators organizations, its potential offers less hope than in the past.

The recent NIE evaluation of the competency-based concept identifies the weaknesses which had been anticipated by experienced practitioners.

Sweeping reforms for the preparation of teachers have been adopted by the State Board of Education in Ohio. Action followed 18 months of intensive deliverations involving over 3,600 participants.....120 meetings ...through a process described as "unique in the annals of public policy development in education."

Thorough, comprehensive and appropriate restructuring of teacher education had been called for by the State Board of Education on May 14, 1973, culminating six years of research-based, long-range planning in anticipation of an improved supply of teachers--a condition essential for the transformation of teacher education institutions.

The approach includes components for the development of clinical skills, basic methodological competencies and expanded field experiences, similar to the Flexner prescription for the redesign of colleges of medicine which were engaged in the preparation of physicians.

Under new standards for Ohio colleges and universities desiring to

prepare teachers:

*all teachers are to be prepared in the teaching of reading; dealing with discipline problems; and working effectively with young people from a variety of social, cultural and racial backgrounds.

*clinical preparation is required to enable teachers to use modern diagnostic instruments and observational techniques so that appropriate learning experiences may be prescribed.

*earlier and more frequent school-based experiences are to be provided prospective teachers to determine if they are suited for teaching and to improve skills in classroom management under actual conditions.

*practical experience is to be completed in different kinds of schools--urban and suburban or rural.

*teacher education is to be organized in a systematic manner similar to other professions, with a fully developed syllabus for each course and the specification of essential prerequisites to assure sequence and continuity.

*more attention is to be directed to the selection and retention of high quality teacher education students.

*relationships with school districts are to be explicated in writing with roles and responsibilities clearly defined.

*broadly representative advisory committees, including school district personnel and lay citizens, are to be used by colleges to plan improvements in teacher education.

*follow-up of graduates is to be conducted to determine how further improvements in teacher education can be attained.

*education professors are to have taught successfully at least three years in an elementary or secondary school.

*faculty/student ratios are to approximate one to fourteen.

*funding in colleges of education needs to be at a level comparable to state allocations for preparation in social work, journalism, agriculture, fine arts, drama and similar professional areas. Currently these areas are funded approximately 50 percent higher than teacher education.

Translation of these standards into actionable models for use by Ohio's 53 colleges and universities engaged in teacher education appears assured through a special purpose $1.25 million 1975-77 biennial appropriation enacted by the General Assembly.

Inservice Teacher Education

Continuing education needs of teachers manifested by societal conditions have been further magnified by historically inadequate inservice assistance. Confounded by a dearth of suitable material, inservice efforts have been typified as being dull and meaningless.

A new concept of stand-free, self-study materials--designed to be used by an individual teacher, a group of teachers or an entire building faculty without costly seminars or institutes--is being implemented in Ohio. Illustrative of this concept is the Teaching Teen Reading Series.

Designed to prepare upper elementary, junior and senior high school teachers to teach reading skills and comprehension, each individualized packet in the series provides condensed, readily usable procedures.

Assessment of print materials and student groups, literal and interpretive comprehension, vocabulary development through word recognition skills and word meaning, sequences of a reading lesson, individualization, and the uses of reading-study skills are the topics highlighted.

Incorporated in these stand-free materials is a self-instruction process beginning with steps for securing information, followed by suggested uses in content teaching situations and a self-corrective post-evaluation.

Maximum utilization of the series is being assured by district Right to Read directors trained during intensive ten-day summer seminars. Sessions focus on human growth and development, program planning and reading instruction techniques.

MAJOR CURRICULUM REDESIGN

Our super-sophisticated technology, rapid urbanization and need to prepare all children and adults for both employment and citizenship responsibilities have surpassed extant elementary and secondary curriculums. Major

curriculum redesign is urgently needed.

An appropriate response to this overarching need would be a national commission--appointed by the various education associations--to assess and recommend a major redesign of the curriculum for American schools.

Including a majority of practitioners, the commission should have an adequate staff to proceed promptly. Publication of an overall design should be targeted within a nine-month timespan.

Elements of curriculum redesign should include:

1. One of two semester courses in both reading and arithmetic for all high school students who score below national norms. Functioning both in the work world and in citizenship responsibilities requires proficiency in the basic skills. Many children may not be successful in reading or arithmetic skills during the elementary grades. However, most of these students, with increased mental maturity, can learn basic skills in high school--if the basics are taught. Such courses should be substituted for other offerings that do not contribute successfully to the development of basic literacy.

2. Grade placement of learning experiences and instructional materials that are suitable for the varying learning needs and capacities encompassed within the concept of serving <u>all</u> children and adults.

3. Attention to the concept enunciated by President Ford a year ago that could result in a policy of government and industry providing cooperative work experiences for drop-out prone or alienated youngsters beginning at age 14.

4. The urgency to include within basic textbooks those concepts pertaining to emergent social issues such as drug, alcohol and tobacco abuse; environmental concerns; energy limitations; consumer economics; and career opportunities.

5. Modification of the school day so that guided learning experiences may take place throughout the community.

6. The position of counselor-coordinator-teacher to serve students who are unable to adjust satisfactorily to school routines, particularly those who exhibit unacceptable emotional and behavioral characteristics.

EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP

Community participation in determining governmental services has been a cherished and vital element of our American heritage. Urbanization and mobility

have spawned a lonely anonymity, and education for citizenship has neither been adequate nor kept pace to cope with the concomitant complexities. Hence, leaders have been inappropriately prepared and many Americans have become turned-off, disillusioned, or alienated. Increased emphasis by schools is urgently needed for citizenship education and citizen involvement.

Citizenship Education

Instructional materials have been prepared by the Ohio Department of Education to better equip students for decision-making in a societal structure marked by giant industry, giant business, giant labor, giant government and giant education. The System and You and a companion piece entitled Education for Voter Competency: A Guide for Conducting Mock Elections have been disseminated broadly.

A four-part resource unit for senior government students, The System and You explores how every individual may become a contributing participant linked to government through voting, membership in political parties or interest groups, and through the basic freedoms of assembly, press and speech.

Suggesting in-school registration by students, polling places and voting procedures, Education for Voter Competency: A Guide for Conducting Mock Elections enables simulation of voting practices under Ohio law. Students are encouraged to explore the duties of the county board of elections and to undertake voter registration drives in both school and community.

Soon to be available for distribution to help students build desirable citizenship knowledge are With And About The News Media, Citizenship Decision-Making: A Sourcebook of Instructional Materials, Grades 4-6, and The American Revolution Bicentennial Sourcebook for Ohio Schools. Development of these innovative curriculum materials is another move by the Ohio Department of Education to encourage more adequate preparation of students for responsible participation in the political process and to help restore the nation's confidence

in its institutions.

Citizen Involvement

New techniques and methods are needed to maximize citizen involvement in the education policy development of school districts and the respective states.

During a recent 15-month period, 125,000 Ohioans participated in a massive "Search for Consensus." A series of 604 local seminars, 88 county assemblies, 12 regional councils and a culminating statewide conference enabled participants to register their opinions for guiding the redesign of Ohio education.

A VOICE FOR EDUCATION

Education is not exempt from the increasing lack of confidence and credibility which characterizes the public view of government--federal, state and local. Absence of these fundamental qualities has severely hampered efforts to redesign and reform elementary and secondary education to be responsive to the needs of twenty-first century adults, today's youth.

An essential link between agencies of government and the public is missing. Articulation of broadly accepted policy direction--reflective of our cultural and social pluralism--is urgently needed. Absence of this policy direction and a recognized unifying voice for education is one of the most critical issues facing the states--the constitutional body responsible for education.

"Identifying Unified Policy Setting Models" has been undertaken by Ohio, Georgia and Iowa through ESEA, TItle V, Section 505 funds. Designed to identify feasible alternative means for creating unified directions in education, this project is in its initial stages.

Expertise of experienced educators throughout the United States will be utilized in developing model approaches to policy development. Ideas and

thoughts from people representing all facets of American education will be obtained to promote cohesiveness and coordination. Results should provide choices for developing policy, with applicability and responsiveness to individual state concerns.

EQUITY IN SCHOOL FINANCE

Countless studies, court decisions, tax formulas and disbursement plans attest to inequities in school finance. Pockets of wealth amidst acres of poverty create, respectively, schools of splendor and schools of squalor--given over-reliance on the property tax as a source of revenue and as an equalizer.

Proponents of school finance reform have assumed erroneously that the poor reside only in districts with low property wealth. This is patently false!

Remedies sought in equity cases such as Rodriquez and Serrano will fail to hit the target unless both property wealth and ability-to-pay are factored into state subsidy formulas. Hence, state school foundation formulas--as a major instrumentality in equalizing resources for education--need to include both income and property.

EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Biecntennial observance of "government of the people, by the people" is inextricably attributable to the people's education. THe "promise of America" continues to be the promise of opportunity--opportunity increasingly predicated upon appropriate education to serve the needs of a varied clientele.

Extension of educational opportunities to all the children of all the people has never been attempted to such an extent by any other people. But then, no other people have conquered so many frontiers.

Career Education

As the world of work becomes more masked from the view of youth and household chores of yesteryear are dissolved by technology, the need for career education increases.

Intense efforts have been undertaken in Ohio to provide students with ample background and motivation for choosing careers.

Major thrusts focus on career motivation in kindergarten through sixth grad, career orientation for seventh and eighth graders, and career exploration or freshmen and sophomores.

Avoidance of excessive start-up and continuation costs is being accomplished by using existing teachers and counselors.

Funding at $20 per elementary pupil, $25 for each seventh and eighth grader and $30 at the high school level has been a significant factor in providing supervisory leadership, inservice preparation and instructional materials for piloting with 179,000 participating students.

Being completed at the present time is a comprehensive series of specially designed text materials to make career education a more integral part of the curriculum.

Vocational Education

Ohio firmly believes that high school students should have the opportunity to obtain both a sheepskin and a bootstrap...the skill to be employed in our technological economy.

School districts enrolling 96.4 percent of all high school students have or exceed a basic program in vocational education, or have voted the necessary funds to construct the essential shops, laboratories and classrooms.

Ohio's march for vocational education represents a capital investment of $453,436,933 during the past decade. Local tax dollars have accounted for

$208,440,130 of this amount, with matching state or federal funds totaling $244,996,803.

Special Education

The percentage of handicapped children has not increased, but sensitive educational practice identifies more of them; and increasing accent on individualized learning assumes more responsibility for them.

When possible, the ideal is to avoid separating handicapped children from their peers, but to give them special learning help. Most of the 53,712 educable mentally retarded youth in Ohio's 3,994 special education classes are joining other youth in general education.

One of the major needs to advance further the "mainstreaming" concept is the inservice education of the regular classroom teacher to work effectively with the handicapped child.

Work-oriented education for the educable mentally retarded in Ohio has been increasingly successful, as employers, community leaders and parents acknowledge the occupational abilities of EMR pupils and create new work opportunities for them. This, couples with many new EMR curricular offerings, has led many of society's formerly "hidden children" to the ranks of self-sufficient, taxpaying citizens.

Evidence that EMR graduates are now holding their own in the labor market has been shown by the fact that 84 percent of 2,104 seniors who graduated in 1973 have been employed full time since receiving their diplomas.

For severely handicapped children requiring elaborate and expensive equipment of where incidence of a particular handicap is low, cooperative arrangements for special classes need to be made among neighboring school districts.

A national study of practices in "mainstreaming," cooperative employment arrangements and ancillary learning experiences is indicated at this time to

further refine progress made in helping the handicapped become fully contributing, participating citizens.

EPILOGUE

As this country prepares to enter its third century as the oldest representative republic, eighteenth-century American revolutionary commitment, enthusiasm and vigor are needed to explicate these essential requisites for education. Designed to meet the needs of the times with integrity and practicality, the challenge of redesign can foster an educational renaissance to revitalize this nation.

OKLAHOMA

Leslie Fisher
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

State Education agencies are being presented more major problems and issues currently than any time in the past. The issues to be discussed in this paper relate basically to one major area, Special Education, but have implications for every aspect of public school programming. The following issues are by no means all inclusive, but are selected problems chosen for discussion because of their imperative need for prompt discussion, study, evaluation, and exploration of alternative solutions. The concepts creating the issues are:

1. The proliferation of funding authority to a multitude of diverse agencies with a conflicting USOE requirement for responsibility to rest in the State Education Agency.
2. The "zero reject" philosophy seen in court decision.
3. The "Least Restrictive Alternative" philosophy for delivery of services.
4. The observed major thrust toward pre-school programs for the handicapped, i.e.: what constitutes elementary and secondary education.
5. The conflict between equal funding (money follows the child) and the provisions of adequate educational opportunity for all children and youth.

6. The conflict between confidentiality of personal information and the requirement of identifying all handicapped, their location and the status of the educational programming.

Now a more detailed look at each problem area.

A. Proliferation of authority vs. single agency responsibility.

Current guidelines to implement state plans for Part B EHA as amended by P.L. 93-380 indicates that the State Education Agency should be designated as the sole agency for the administration of the State Plan under Part B. A summary of the main points set out in the House and Senate reports indicates:

a. The full services goal and implementation plan is to be concerned with all handicapped children regardless of their location or the agency that is serving them.

b. The plan is regarded as a State plan and not simply an SEA plan.

c. Other agencies are expected to provide information on the children for whom they are responsible; and all appropriate agencies and disciplines are to participate in the planning.

d. Federal funds for education of the handicapped from other federal acts are to be included in the resource allocation plan.

e. The plan is expected to be updated periodically.

f. The Commissioner is expected to establish "Criteria" which if followed would enhance the achievement of State goals.

In Oklahoma, as in manh other states, funding authority and responsibility for the education of the handicapped is vested in several agencies. The Department of Institutions, Social and Rehanilitation Services has authority over the Schools for the Retarded as well as the State School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing and the Blind and Partially Sighted. The Mental Health Department has the funding and authority over the schools for the emotionally disturbed. Vocational education is a separate department from the Department of Education and there are several district legislative authorizations such as:

a. Cerebral Palsy Center, Norman, Oklahoma

b. University of Oklahoma Science Center (Program of Deaf Education)

c. University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma (Program of Deaf Education)

d. Discretionary grants from various federal agencies directly to grantees in the state without input to the S.E.A.

In addition, Oklahoma maintains a separation of state from private educational operations.

All of the above factors complicate the actual development of an effective functional "State Plan." Cooperative efforts between the mentioned agencies have been excellent; however, maintaining communication and flow of data creates time problems for the coordinating agency, the S.D.E.

SOLUTION ALTERNATIVES

1. Require responsibility only for areas over which S.D.E. has authority.
2. Redirection of all federal funding for the handicapped so as to be handled by the S.D.E.
3. Promote implementation with assistance from the Governors, Chief State School Officers and State legislative bodies, coordinating legislation to provide the SEA as the sole agency for coordinating and planning all education for the handicapped.

B. The "Zero reject" Philosophy

Recent court decisions have confirmed the right of every individual to an appropriate education. The decisions imply that every individual regardless of the degree of handicap has some potential for learning. The writer, in no way, denies the validity of the above statements, but is concerned about the implications of the rulings as they are being interpreted and applied to the determination of who is responsible for the provision of the services and who is to determine the appropriateness of such services. While no specific

delineation of responsibility has been made, there appears to be a movement to consider public education as responsible regardless of degree of handicaps. The major concern lies in the extent and degree each local education agency will be required to provide, within that local community, a program for each individual child.

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

1. Recognition of the continued need for institutional placement of some children.
2. Recognition that some children and youth are so handicapped the problem is medical rather than educational.
3. Involvement of state agencies in recommending solutions before any major mandates be placed on L.E.A.

C. The "Least Restrictive Alternative" Philosophy

1. All special placement must be viewed as it relates to the individual's needs and his chances of success in the suggested placement.
2. Enforcement of placement changes must be a gradual, planned movement and only after all supportive services needed are available. Complete knowledge of the individual's problems must be available and understood by every teacher involved. Most important is the readiness to accept the additional load and above all the child with problems.

D. Pre-School Education for the Handicapped

It is generally recognized that a high percentage of an individual's abilities are developed by age four. This development assumes intact physical, mental and emotional abilities as well as an environment conducive to the individual's growth. By definition, the handicapped child meets his environment with impaired abilities. The result is delayed development in direct relationship to the degree of impairment. Specialized intervention at the earliest possible

moment is a must if the impact of the disability is to be minimized. The question is not should there be intervention; but, how soon, by whom and what should be done.

Once again, it appears that public education is being viewed as the vehicle for reaching these children. Head Start Programs, usually under community action programs, have been involved to some extent as have the so called "Well Baby Clinics" under Health Department auspices. The Child Study Center under DISRS in Oklahoma City and Childrens Medical Center in Tulsa, both have extensive evaluative services and some educational programming.

The diversity of agencies and programs already partially involved will call for extensive inter-communication and cooperation to insure maximum impact without duplication and yet, provide for continuity as one agency reaches the extent of their allowed involvement.

If public education is going to be required to coordinate and be responsible for a "State Plan", extensive support from all levels of education and government are a must. Legislative involvement in removing legal barriers and in providing funds become absolute necessities. Education personnel, both at the state and local levels, must be flexible in viewing "What is Education." Traditionally, many educators view their function as beginning when the child is ready. That is, ready to begin to read, write and cipher. There will need to be much inservice education to develop an accepting climate among many educators before meaningful pre-school programming can be successful.

ALTERNATIVES

a. State public education be assigned the major responsibility for pre-school education of the handicapped with appropriate funding and authority to accomplish the task.

b. A multi-agency consortium be established by Legislature or Governor to delineate responsibility and function of various agencies for

segments of the program.

E. Equal Funding vs. Equal Opportunity

Recent philosophy being expounded in the Congress of the United States and expressed in court decisions such as the provision of equal dollars for physical activities for both men and women is causing great concern among educators, Title IX, and people responsible for funding of educational efforts. State taxing structure is under examination again on the basis of unequal funding per child. Carried to its extreme, this concept could cause a multitude of problems. Comprehensive educational programming is replete with examples of high cost and low cost programs. If equal funds were expended on each individual student's program, many specialized classes would not be possible.

Some students need more specialized help if they are to succeed; therefore, equal expenditures cannot be equated with equal opportunity.

The handicapped provide a major example of the need for differential funding and programming. To provide a program, for example, for five deaf children with the funds generated by them from the tax structure is obviously impossible.

The Chief State School Officers should take a very careful look at this concept as being presented by Congress in relation to the Education of the Handicapped Act. Funds distributed on the basis of the number of handicapped in any L.E.A., unless there is a massive increase in funding, cannot provide sufficient funds to initiate programs of sufficient size and scope to be adequate in meeting the need of the handicapped. Carried to its logical conclusion, equal funding would destroy equal opportunity for individual growth.

ALTERNATIVES

a. Distribution of funds based on evidence of programming of sufficient size and scope to meet determined needs.

b. Determination of specific program cost with funding based on program, not number of children involved.

F. Confidentiality vs. Need for Information to do Adequate State Planning

Recent decisions on parents' rights to information and the need to protect the privacy of the individual as it relates to personally identifiable data presents a variety of problems.

Amendments to the EHA by P.L. 93-380, as they relate to the handicapped, need much study and clarification. The "full service to all handicapped" goal includes the need for a statewide location, identification and evaluation of all handicapped individuals to age 21. Involved in this goal is the ability to determine if the identified handicapped are being served or not and is the service provided adequate to meet their needs.

Present guidelines are less than definitive as to who may have personally identifiable data. What type of data is also under question?

It is obvious that in order to do adequate state planning, comprehensive information must be readily available to the planning committee. Every attempt possible needs to be made to prevent the final guidelines and regulations from becoming so rigid as to prevent needed information being readily available.

ALTERNATIVES

a. Allow state education agencies to maintain a file of all the handicapped in the state. The use of some coding system could maintain confidentiality as the only location of actual names would be at the L.E.A. This could be curtailed by the Privacy Act or Buckley Amendment.

b. Establish a common system at the L.E.A. so that data on the handicapped child could be derived with minimum time lag.

SUMMARY

This paper was not an attempt to exhaust the long list of issues and problems facing education. The issues chosen were viewed from the impact

they would have as related to handicapped children. This point of view was used as these general concerns become more visible when viewed from the standpoint of a limited population whose special need accentuate the issues. The issues are relevant in varying degrees as they impact on different segments of public education. Hopefully, the comments made will generate general interest and involvement in seeking various alternatives as solutions to the issues.

OREGON

Verne A. Duncan
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Special Education

Oregon's initial legislative response to court decisions extending the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to public education for the handicapped (Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Citizens v. Pennsylvania and Mills v. Board of Education) has been relatively swift but falls short in some respects. Specifically, school districts have been given new responsibilities without the major infusion of dollars they need to meet these.

In 1973 the Oregon Legislature enacted HB 2444 which struck from the compulsory school attendance law those provisions permitting the exclusion of children mentally and physically unabel to attend school or those determined by the local school board to be unable to benefit from education. House Bill 2444 also required local school boards to identify handicapped children in their districts who had not been mainstreamed into the public school system and to consult with parents before deciding to place a handicapped child in a special education program. The bill called for assistance for local districts from the State Department of Education "whenever possible."

This year's Legislature passed SB 157, introduced at the request of the State Board. As originally drafted, SB 157 provided 50% state funds for the

approved cost of education for handicapped children served in local district programs, and a number of witnesses on the bill urged 100% state support. As finally passed, however, SB 157 provides 30%. The bill also remedies an inadequacy of HB 2444 by providing a hearing process for placement of children into special education.

Oregon has taken some important steps with the enactment of these two bills, but there are still major problems. Questions have been raised about whether surveys conducted by local school districts to determine the number of handicapped children were thorough. There may well be handicapped children still "hidden" to be located and mainstreamed. And while the 30% state support will help significantly, local districts still face major financial burdens in mainstreaming handicapped children.

As a result, bills now before Congress to provide expanded federal aid for the education of the handicapped are a high priority for Oregon. Because of the Department's role so far in helping to develop education for the handicapped, we are particularly concerned that state educational agencies be responsible for the allocation of funds appropriated under these bills.

Indian Education

The fundamental question of whether separate schools for Indians will be--or should be--perpetuated is currently the focus of some controversy in Oregon as Chemawa Indian School, a boarding school in Salem serving approximately 200 Indian students, seeks funds for new facilities.

The related question is whether the Bureau of Indian Affairs will continue to play a major role in formulating federal education policy for Indians or whether USOE will assume an increasing share of the responsibility for Indian education.

To help answer these questions, Congress has formed the American Indian Policy Review Commission. This Commission, which includes six Congressional

members and five Native Americans, has established a task force to consider educational issues. In the meantime, Oregon's Senator Mark Hatfield has proposed an amendment to the Bureau of Indian Affairs budget that would provide $5.5 million for Chemawa's new facilities. The fate of this school is not likely to be decided without further controversy between those who think separate schools such as Chemawa are essential to the preservation of Native American culture and those who feel Native Americans should be mainstreamed into our public educational system.

Other issues.....

Partly because of the results of a statewide assessment in reading, improvement of reading skills has become a major concern in Oregon. Unfortunately, despite several years of rhetoric on the Right to Read, federal funds for this commitment have failed to increase significantly.

The role of state and local educational agencies in early childhood education should be clearly defined in any legislation in this area. In Oregon the main responsibility for day care is vested in the State Children's Services Division; however, the 1975 Legislature directed the Department of Education to establish guidelines for early childhood programs in local school districts.

Although the drop-out rate is increasing at an alarming rate in even a non-urban state like Oregon, drop-out prevention remains a low priority for federal funding.

New Legislation on Family Rights and Privacy Act

The new federal legislation regarding parent and student confidentiality has created some problems regarding the forwarding of student records across state lines. In some cases, school districts are choosing to withhold student records for reasons of privacy. In other cases, they are withheld because of lack of payment of fees. In the former case of withholding student records on

the basis of privacy, this is clearly not the intent of federal legislation. In the latter case, the practice of withholding student records for nonpayment of fees is illegal in most cases and against accreditation standards in others.

It is recommended that Chief State School Officers issue a statement to their respective school districts urging them to forward student records in accordance with regulations which have been established. Clearly, the position of educators should be to provide maximum support to students in transferring from one state to another. Withholding student records can only result in complicating and making more difficult the adjustment to a new school situation.

We should encourage other states to enact procedures that require forwarding of records similar to Oregon's requirement. Perhaps federal legislation should be amended to require prompt forwarding of records on notice of transfer and that it would be illegal to withhold student records on the basis of nonpayment of fees.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Cyril B. Busbee
State Superintendent of Education

CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL ISSUES:

1. Equalization of educational opportunity through Educational Finance Reform.
2. Desegregation of public school systems throughout the United States and its territorial units.
3. Seeking judicial interpretations and decisions that will preserve both the rights of individuals and educational opportunity.
4. Securing a Federal aid to education program that will tend to equalize financial resources among the States and Territories.
5. Orienting educational programs to the needs of society. Defining society in terms that the masses can understand.

6. Finding an acceptable balance between the educational well-being of children and teacher welfare. If not found, this problem alone can spell the doom of public education.

7. Identifying and instituting a system of governance of education that is related to the source or sources of support.

SCHOOL FINANCE REFORM

The decade of the sixties in the field of public education was characterized by a proliferation of desegregation plans, court orders, and bussing to achieve racial equality. Parts of the nation are still heavily involved in desegregation issues, thus leaving the history books open in the area; however, a new chapter has begun for the seventies with the major heading being school finance reform. As early as the 1920's writers laid the theoretical foundation for the programs being implemented in many states today. The impetus for today's revival in legislation regarding school finance is probably linked to the social reform of the sixties and the taxpayers' revolts of the late sixties and early seventies.

School finance reform has in recent years been a two headed movement. One area was epitomized in the Serrano decision, which illustrated the fiscal neutrality doctrine. This doctrine provides in its basic form that each child, as an educational ward of the state, must be guaranteed equal access to the state's wealth devoted for public education. The second area which was brought to the forefront in Robinson v. Cahill establishes that not only should the state provide equal access to dollars for each child, but the level of access should be educationally sufficient for the child.

While numerous real results have already been recorded, the school finance movement is still gaining momentum even in spite of the present economic recession. To date, practically every state in the union has initiated a study of its finance scheme and possible alternatives. The Federal government is also getting into

the act responding to the complaints of those states which have initiated equalization plans only to find such plans compromised by the flow of Federal funds. This response is seen in some of the new guidelines and proposed amendments for the distribution of Federal funds which recognize local tax effort and equalization plans.

In attempting to characterize the school finance reform legislation that has been implemented, the so-called equalization model seems to be by and f · the most popular form. Those people who have come in contact with school finance issues will recognize the equalization model as the plan which distributes state money to local districts in inverse proportion to the local districts' ability to pay. Since in most states the majority of the local revenue is derived from property taxes, the only meaningful determination for local ability is the valuation of property subject to ad valorem taxes. It is significant that practically each state which has revamped or even closely studied its finance scheme has had legislation introduced dealing to varying degrees with property tax reform. While the school finance reform movement cannot take full credit for these changes in the property tax area, it must be considered a contributing factor.

Equalization models fall into one of two broad areas, those that take into consideration the necessary variations in pupil needs either through a weighted pupil unit or some other special unit which provides for the cost differences between pupil categories, and those which provide a uniform amount per unit without giving consideration to variations in cost for the different educational programs and services. However, even in those states which fall into the latter type, some form of differentials are usually found in other sections of their finance scheme. Therefore, it is safe to state that the concept of providing funds according to established standards of need, while not a new concept, will be included in almost all new financial legislation.

Another common factor in those states which have implemented new finance laws, is the increased level of support from the state. This increase, usually a product of state's increased revenue potential during the early part of the seventies or the use of Federal revenue sharing funds, helped those states to upgrade the funding level of the poorer districts without causing any dramatic changes in the funding level of the richer districts. The states which have implemented changes in the last year or so and those states which are planning changes in the near future are not afforded this luxury. In these states, we find elaborate "hold harmless" provisions and "phase in" plans with the initial funding level of the equalization program being at the very minimum level. The problem is compounded in many states which now rely heavily on local funding because no additional financial support can be expected from these local sources. Therefore, the additional funds needed for equalization must be provided from the state with its broader taxing base or from new programs from the Federal government which is surely unlikely for the foreseeable future.

In regard to local add-ons or local leeway, there is great variation among the states. The spectrum has generally run from those states which are systematically reducing the leeway option to a zero level to those states which have left the option entirely to the local governing body. Naturally most states have installed plans which are between the two extremes by allowing limited leeway. Some states which have the fiscal capability are power equalizing the leeway options either through state funds or charge backs on the rich local districts.

In conclusion on the movement nationally, it is interesting to note in many states where new school finance legislation exists that the legislators have seen fit to include sections in the law to insure that the funds will be expended in the appropriate manner. It is quite clear that such laws are definitely helping to usher in the accountability decade.

Accountability in addressing school finance reform is as appropriate as is accountability in the operational phases. Thus, the following questions about any proposal for improving the equalization of a state's educational aid system should be addressed before a specific program of reform is proposed.

(1) Why is a new equalization plan necessary? What are the present variations in taxes and expenditures among the state's school districts? Do these fiscal differences result in inequitable and burdensome local school taxes? Do they demonstrably affect the ability of school districts to offer high quality educational services or to even attain the mandates of the Defined Minimum Program? Unequal educational services and taxpayer inequities have generally provided the rationale for finance reform in other states; their existence and severity in South Carolina would be a natural backdrop to promoting any new equalization plan.

(2) What are the basic principles of a new equalization proposal? Other state school finance reforms have sought to (a) neutralize wealth differentials among school districts, (b) recognize educational need in disbursing state aid, (c) be aware of the fiscal demands of high-cost school districts, or (d) gradually equalize the spending levels of all school districts within a state. To attain these goals, states have redistributed education aid to poor districts, areas with concentrated educational needs, or school units that have to pay a high price for their educational services. Which of these aims are to be central in a new state school finance plan?

Are wealth differences the main finance problem in the state? Are poor districts not raising their school taxes due to fear of local tax competition?

Are local property tax bases growing faster in richer communities rather than poorer ones? How do differences in educational need manifest themselves among school units? How do retention and dropout rates compare? What about the relative incidence of special education, vocational education, and compensatory education students? Where are these high-cost students located and how well are

they being served by their school districts? What about educational price variations? What do different districts have to pay to attract various types of qualified educational personnel? How do the prices of non-personnel services vary? Do non-educational service and tax burdens differ from district to district? Do they reduce a district's ability to raise additional money for local schools? Should these various factors be recognized in a new school finance plan?

Closely related to these questions are matters concerning the feasibility of trying to determine these wealth, need, tax effort, and educational cost differences among districts. We have already begun to examine some of the problems of determining accurate estimates of taxable property values. Similar ones occur in other areas. How are students to be classified if educational need is to be met through a pupil weighting system? How well can different types of students be identified in the school population? What are the levels of service, hence pupil weighting, to be offered to students with different educational needs? On the price side, do we have accurate data about the costs that various school districts have to incur to attain various services? Do some districts settle for inferior personnel and other services when they cannot pay the going price? Do richer school units corner the market on the pool of available high-quality services? Can we accurately measure residential and individual local property tax burdens? Does a high level of municipal services dry up available monies for local school taxation? Detailed tax, expenditure, personnel, pupil, and local budget analyses may provide the answers to many of these feasibility questions.

(3) <u>What is the specific type of funding plan that is best suited to meet the goals of any new equalization proposal?</u> If simple expenditure equalization is the aim of a new proposal, full state assumption of all educational finances might be a suitable program. If wealth differentials are the key finance plan, a full-scale foundation plan may be the answer. If, on the other hand,

local districts are to retain their freedom to choose the level of their education budgets, a district power equalization or guaranteed tax base plan might be the vehicle for a new finance plan. Are pupil weightings or a categorical aid program focused on the neediest districts the best way of meeting diverse educational needs in a new aid plan? Or should a new proposal be a hybrid of all these measures--a frequent occurrence in many other states.

(4) What is the total cost and fiscal impact of a new equalization plan? How much will the new proposal cost in additional state and local tax money? How will the costs be apportioned among state and local governments? Are educational costs under the plan likely to increase, decrease, or remain stable over time? Should the plan be phased in or adopted all at once? Are expenditure controls on state or local contributions to the finance plan required? How much will different local districts be able to raise school expenditures or lower school taxes or do both under the new plan? How will any proposed plan integrate Federal monies into the total funding program? What are the Federal restraints in equalization or finance reform?

(5) What are the ultimate ends of the new finance proposal? How should a new finance plan be evaluated in the future? What are the key fiscal and educational goals that are to be implemented by the reform? Is the quality and scope of educational services in different districts to be raised? Are local tax burdens to be raised, lowered, or made more equitable? Is educational productivity to be improved perhaps in accord with the Defined Minimum Program? What are the probabilities of attaining these various fiscal and educational goals? What are the obstacles to the attainment of these ends and what other legislative or executive action needs to be taken outside of the finance proposal to make sure that it is an effective and enduring one? This reference is to further district consolidation, degree of local and state control, etc.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Thomas C. Todd
State Superintendent of Education

The most important issue in viewing the role of the Federal Government is public school education must be the need to increase the level of Federal funding.

Recent improvements in Federal-State relationships must be continued.

Continued emphasis should be given to consolidated grants to State education agencies.

Indian Education. In South Dakota, one of the unique problems concerns Indian education and the jurisdicational responsibilities. The reestablishment of community schools and the use of the concept of career education can be vital outlets in resolving this issue.

National Education Minimum Foundation Program. One of the most meaningful thrusts the Federal Government can make in assuring educational equality in the United States and its territories is to adopt a national minimum foundation program which recognizes the mobility of our nation and the resulting impact in social change upon our youth and adults.

Secretary of Education. If the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, Interior, Navy, Army, and Treasury merit Cabinet status, certainly the most important function of any government (education) should be accorded the same degree of recognition by establishing a Department of Education at the national level with a Secretary who advises the President.

Federal Collective Bargaining Legislation. Collective bargaining for public employees, the Federal Government should defer to the states in this vital area of puboic concern.

UTAH

Walter D. Talbot
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Utah, traditionally, has been recognized for high quality education. This recognition has come as a result of a people with intense interest in education and a commitment to the ideals which most of them believe are achieved through education. In this setting it is difficult to imagine that problems are encountered. Yet most of the problems in education in the nation are found in Utah. Any discussion of education problems by state will, therefore, overlap.

Providing Greater Financial Resources. New sources of financial support must be found. Yet, conversely, federal government activity, or lack of it, plays a role in holding the lid on the tax base.

Nearly 70 per cent of the land in Utah is owned by the federal government. Utah is rich in mineral resource but that resource lies either on federal land or access to it is controlled by federal ownership. It would be helpful to Utah's financial base if several things were to occur.

1. Provide a survey of the federal lands in Utah and make more of them available for private ownership and development.
2. Lift the moratorium on mineral exploration on federal lands and ease the restrictions on access across federal lands.
3. Subsidize the development and exploration of known mineral deposits.

In addition to making federal lands more productive as a resource for the operation of state and local government, the federal government should provide through direct appropriation a higher percentage of the funds needed for public instruction.

Public Involvement in Education. Mechanisms must be found for meaningful

involvement of more individuals and groups in influencing educational decisions. Involving citizens in determining the role of the schools in solving individual and community problems is the highest order of democratic practice.

Recent efforts in the Community Education movement is a step in the right direction. To build upon that movement holds promise. We must spend less time trying to convince ourselves and other what the people want from our own point of view and instead find methods and processes that work so that people may speak for themselves.

Governance in Education. With the inextricable movement of the federal government into public education come a number of questions: What is the proper role of the U.S. Office of Education? Is the traditionally honored concept of education as a state responsibility being challenged? Should responsibility and authority in education be diffused among many departments and agencies at all levels or government?

Yet, daily activity occurs from the federal level which brings a challenge to the constitutional authority and responsibility of the Utah State Board of Education. Can and should the U.S. Office of Education dictate the kinds of programs, including the setting of objectives and evaluating against those objectives, that will operate in Utah public schools? Can and should the Office of Civil Rights investigate and deal directly without approval and even the knowledge of the state office of education? Can and should federal laws and rules and regulations of federal agencies prescribe the composition, function, and precise responsibility of advisory councils which are to advise atate and local education agencies and report their successes and failures directly to the federal government or to counterpart councils at the federal level?

Complexity of Society. Educators must find ways of humanizing, individualizing or personalizing education not only to give more attention to greater productivity

in people but to permit people to develop in themselves a more humane attitude and a higher self-image.

Teacher education and teacher training insitutions need to be redesigned to give to all teachers the basic skill to teach the fundamentals of reading, writing, and computing in addition to content areas of major and minor subjects and to enhance pedagogical techniques and human relationships.

Administration must be trained in supervisory techniques and how to deal with the various factions of a community.

Pupil-teacher ratios, at least in the primary grades, must be reduced to allow individual attention to be given to students to reduce failure and enhance the self-image.

Redesigning teacher education and teacher training institutions, includes greater attention to the responsibility of state and local education agencies and the profession itself for inservice training.

Greater emphasis must be focused upon man's place in the world community and his relationship to other cultures and the acceptance of other traditions.

Twenty-four different languages are used as the basic language in the various homes in Utah; an additional forty-two languages are spoken in the homes of Utah thus providing not only a challenge but a vast resource upon which the schools may draw to develop their capacity to deal with a multi-faceted culture.

VERMONT

Robert A. Withey
Commissioner of Education

State Aid to Education. State assistance in the financing of public schools has been a feature of our society for nearly all of the current

century. Indeed the need for state government to play such a role is no longer questioned. Left to local government, the resources devoted to public education would be inadequate to the take of providing the kind and quality of services desired by society. The ability of communities to finance public education, moreover, varies widely, reflecting the unevenness with which wealth tends to concentrate.

Of the 247 school districts which received state aid in 1974, 91 were granted "Floor" aid. Total state aid allocated via the Floor amounted to $678 thousand, a tiny fraction of the overall appropriation of $33.8 million.

Had the state "fully funded" the system in 1974--which would have required a $45.3 million appropriation--only 65 districts would have been relegated to the Floor, receiving in total $400,000 of state aid.

"This so-called "Miller Formula" was designed to equalize the ability of school districts to support public education. It has failed to do so. The primary cause of its failure has not been underfunding by the state. It lies in the system's fundamental misrepresentation of the fiscal ability of the school district by its equalized grand list. So long as property values continue to serve as the basis for distribution of state aid, it would be a mistake for the State to increase its proportionate share in public school finance."[1]

The point to be stressed is that solving the problem of equalization (financially and educationally) is just like trying to solve most other social problems; more taxes are almost always required.

School District Organization. Initial impetus for the current State Department of Education study on state school district organization came from the Vermont legislature. The final report of the Legislative Joint Committee on Educational Finance and Taxation, which had been deliberating for two years,

---

[1] "Tashman Report", 1974.

was issued in September, 1973. Among the recommendations in that report was one addressed to the Vermont State Board of Education which read: "The Committee recommends the orderly consolidation of school districts where such consolidation is indicated by educational need."

The assumption is almost universally made that this can best be accomplished by more efficient utilization of funds and that more efficient utilization of funds is best achieved by fewer and larger administrative units. At the same time, most of the studies conclude that the continued failure of the State to take action to reorganize itself into fewer and larger districts is due to resistance at the local level becuase of anticipated higher initial or permanent costs. Several of the studies mentioned the necessity of financial incentives in the form of increased state aid or other methods in order to get reorganization accepted. Thus, ironically, measures presumed to lead to savings in funds apparently may not be effected unless more money is spent.

Few people realize that today we operate seven different types of school districts (town, city, incorporated, joint contracts, union, unified, and interstate school districts) each governed under a different set of statutes. One of the values which Vermonters hold dearest of all their public affairs is local control. Maintaining the status quo will in all likelihood allow citizens less and less real control over the conduct of their local schools in the future at the same time that it perpetuates the enormous disparities in school services from our 278 existing districts.

Early Childhood Education - Parenting. "The development of a child does not begin the day he is born--or at the age of three--but much earlier, during the formative years of his parents. The school's task is to assure that adults will have the education they need to raise healthy, productive children."

(Commissioner T.H. Bell, "Parenting and the Public Schools", June 2, 1975, Atlantic City, National PTA Congress.) The State Department of Education seeks to establish a position on early childhood education in relation of the State Board of Education to its legal authority and responsibility and those of other departments and agencies, including the family.

Racial and Cultural Isolation. 1968-State Board of Education Resolution.

Public Schools are urged to select materials and plan curricula that provide:

1. Space treatment commensurate with their contributions be given to the roles of the various minority groups in our culture.

2. Accurate portrayal be given of the role of minority groups and their leaders in historical events.

3. Illustrations reflecting the varied ethnic components of American Society be given in whatever aspects that society is discussed.

Other Critical Education Issues and Problems:

Struggling with Inflation and Reduction in State Resources. Inflation and the reduction or level funding of the State educational appropriations has already taken a bite out of numerous education programs at the local educational level.

Conservation of Energy. The energy crisis has progressed to the point where the conservation of energy has become a necessity. Shortage of fuels (reliance on exports from Middle East and Canada) and skyrocketing costs are today's reality.

Career Education. All teachers are not trained or committed to Career Education. The drop out rate has not decreased.

Health Education. Comprehensive health education to include but not be limited to body structure and function, community health, safety, disease protection, family health, personal health, consumer health, growth and development, drugs, and mood modifiers, and nutrition.

Student Leadership and Governance. Vermont Headmasters' Association (Secondary School Principals) are presently exploring ways of providing meaningful student leadership training and governance.

Post-Secondary Coordination. Develop state-wide goals for post-secondary education in Vermont. The question of organization, goals-accomplishments gaps, resources--costs, assessability, duplication and coordination/cooperation are important issues.

Vermort Educational TV. With the receipt of Federal Funds to purchase new color equipment, Vermont Educational TV is still confronted with problems of funds for programming, inflationary energy costs, and reception barriers.

Alternative in Education. The idea of providing educational alternatives or options has become increasingly attractive to large numbers of parents, students, and teachers.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Gwendolyn E. Kean
Acting Commissioner of Education

All around the United States, superintendents are talking about decreasing enrollments; the opposite is true in the Virgin Islands where the boom years of the 60's brought in immigrant labor from the neighboring islands. In order to stem the high turn-over rate, application was made to use Title I funds to train teacher aides of some ability as teachers for grades K through 3.

In the area of In-service training and staff development, the Department of Education fails dismally for two reasons: lack of planning and teaching personnel and lack of funds.

Maintenance of Effort. This local aspect of federal funding which demands an equal or an increased share on the part of the receiving state can create problems.

Bi-lingual, Bi-cultural Education. There are several Spanish-speaking settlements in St. Croix. Many of the children who attend the public schools

are second and third generations, the first group having gone to that island from the Puerto Rico dependencies of Vieques and Culebra.

Special Education. At this point our big problem in special education is expanding our services to include other handicapped categories. "Mainstreaming" has not been well accepted and the special education division is concentrating on plans of approach with the teachers involved.

Federally Funded Programs. Some attempt should be made at USOE to adapt those parts of federally funded programs which do not pertain to the territories or which are at variance with the laws and customs of these areas in order to make for smoother implementation.

VIRGINIA

W. E. Campbell
Superintendent of Public Instruction

A critical issue having strong national implications is already under discussion in Virginia--the question of lowering the compulsory school attendance age.

Some recommendations:

1. The Committee recommends the development of graduation requirements reflecting achievement of competencies deemed essential to the survival of the individual and the society.
2. Develop alternative schools and/or program alternatives within to provide instructional curricular choices for parents and students.
3. Reduce the compulsory school attendance age requirement in the Commonwealth from 17 years to 16 years effective September, 1976. It is urged that the compulsory attendance law be aggressively and faithfully enforced. To reduce the compulsory attendance age requirement from 17 to 15 years in the following school divisions, for a three-year trial period, beginning September, 1976.

4. Enact legislation to provide each citizen of the Commonwealth with 12 years of free public education beyond kindergarten, within the public school system, 9 years of which would be compulsory and the remaining 3 years for use at any stagr of life.
5. Eliminate the unnecessary duplication of effort.
6. Work with the Division of Youth Services for improved communication, cooperation, and coordination with all other agencies involved with youth services in Virginia.

WASHINGTON

Frank B. Brouillet
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Critical issues which we have identified are appropriations, funding, ESEA Title I maintenance of effort, ESEA Title IV maintenance of effort, promulgation of federal rules and regulations, vocational education, the National Institute of Education, and the creation of a Department of Education.

Washington is currently faced with a regressive tax system that is forcing local education agencies to pick up a larger percentage of education costs. LEAs are being forced to request larger dollar amounts.

The special levy system has created a confrontation between the State of Washington and the Office of Education. The issue is ESEA Title I, maintenance of effort. From the implementation of the Act until 1974, USOE review teams have told the Superintendent of Public Instruction that the "unusual event" language in federal regulations was a matter for the state education agency to determine. In 1974, the review team changed its stance and ruled that an unusual event could also be determined by the USOE. The OSPI is following what it interprets to be the intent of the Federal Regulations and legislation. Funds are being allocated to LEAs which have suffered levy losses.

The USOE has created a serious problem in our state by changing its opinion on Title I maintenance of effort. It appears to some observers that it is trying to bring pressure upon our state to change its tax structure.

The states are faced with a problem in Title IV of PL 93-380, the Education Amendments of 1974. The maintenance of effort language in the law does not allow for any reduction in maintenance of effort, not even .001%. If current economic trends were to change, many states would find themselves in trouble. It is a point that we must continue to pursue and resolve before a serious problem arises.

Another area of frustration is the promulgation of rules and regulations. A prime obstacle is the time delay between the effective dates of federal legislation and the finalization of rules and regulations. In some cases, rules and regulations are finalized three or more years after passage of leigslation by the Congress. We need to work toward a goal of having rules and regulations finalized before new legislation is implemented.

Such terms as "significant" and "substantial" are difficult to interpret. USOE staff members give very little flexibility in interpreting rules, regulations, and guidelines. This results in a rigidity that leads to problems such as our current Title I controversy.

However, states are expected to be in compliance whether or not they have adequate information with which to comply.

Most of the problems created by federal rules and regulations arise when the USOE attempts to add its interpretations of Congressional intent to the regulation drafting process.

The USOE is not consistent in terms of identifying specific program requirements. For example, maintenance of effort requirements are different for Title I and Title IV of PL 93-380, yet the purpose of maintenance of

effort is exactly the same. An initial step in improving this process should be the formation of a committee representing chief state school officers to research areas of commonality in education regulations.

Coordination of federal programs would be more efficient if direct aid to school districts were eliminated. When funds bypass the SEA, it creates an opportunity for double funding, as has happened in Indian Education. Some type of flow through provision on all federal dollars would be an improvement.

In the same vein, state offices should be given more flexibility in state office staffing. For instance, when the USOE directs Washington to increase staff for a federal program, they are in direct conflict with a hiring limitation imposed by the Washington State Legislature.
We need to direct special attention to the elimination of the single state agency concepts for the distribution of funds.

Once legislation is passed, the USOE should finally give vocational education the commitment it requires to enable it to reach a higher level of effectiveness.

Chief State School Officers and the Office of Education could start by developing greater involvement by business and industry.

Many bills centering on pre-school education have been introduced during this session of Congress. The current situation regarding responsibilities for pre-school education is in real need of clarification.

We need to have discussions with our Congressional delegations and provide them with information on how the NIE can best meet the needs of research and development for elementary and secondary education. At the same time, we need to continue to work with NIE so that they know our needs and desires.

Hopefully we will have a separate Department of Education and that we might get some people to stay there long enough for us to sit down and work

out some of these programs. I agree with Senator Magnuson and hope that all of us will set the establishment of a Department of Education as one of our priority goals.

It is time to reassess the federal role in education. Education forces and specifically state education agencies, must begin to decide the education programs in which the federal government can most effectively participate during the next ten years. If we fail to initiate this process, it may be done for us and without our input.

WEST VIRGINIA

Daniel B. Taylor
State Superintendent of Schools

Issues that confront educational decision-makers in West Virginia are, in all probability, not unlike those prevalent in other states. Issues that seem particularly troublesome currently:

1. Equalizing educational opportunity.
2. Properly financing public education.
3. Desegregating public education.
4. Restoring public confidence in public endeavors.
5. Educating school teachers in a way that will prepare them to teach effectively.
6. Re-evaluating the American High School and perhaps abolishing it.
7. Determining who shall control public education.
8. Re-assessing the Federal role in elementary and secondary education.
9. Attempting to control the ever-expanding responsibilities
10. Responding to the clear contradiction of (a) shrinking enrollments (b) sky-rocketing costs and (c) falling student achievement.

The shocking implications of spending more and more on fewer and fewer

students with poorer and poorer results as measured by student achievement tests are as potentially explosive as they are disheartening to those who have invested their time, money, and energy in a public education system in the belief that the system worked. This critical issue transends all others at this particular time in over-all importance, and is one toward which OE and the CSSO could profitably direct their energies.

WISCONSIN

Barbara Thompson
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Every step into the future requires keen sensitivity to the issues and the dynamics for change. Maintenance of a balance between political and professional activism requires all policy makers to base decisions upon logical considerations, scrutiny of established practices, and evidence-based data.

The following pattern for action is being used as a general policy in the Department of Public Instruction and should serve as an assurance that the commissioned papers will be challenged before suggested policy decisions are established and implemented. The following is an outline of the decision-making model that we have utilized during my tenure in office:

1. Define the problem or issue
2. Identify different points of view
3. Collect all relevant information
4. Analyze and interpret information
5. Disseminate all information and the alternative solutions
6. Sample preferences to alternative solutions
7. Announce decisions
8. Evaluate effectiveness of action

The issues discussed include the following topics: Early childhood education, Career education, Community involvement in education, Alternative schools, Educational assessment, Humanizing and individualizing education, Inservice education, Teacher collective negotiations, Regional service units (CESA), and Federal aid to education.

Early Childhood Education: Policy Options

A brief summary of the dilemma confronting policy makers in regard to programs for young children suggests that there are three distinct sets of issues which require attention in order to develop relevant and coherent social and educational policy. They are as follows:

1. What constitutes effective early childhood programming, educational or otherwise? They do not exist in the United States

2. Who would most appropriately be responsible for policy development and program implementation in early childhood services? A variety of human service agencies including health, education, and social welfare units, have appropriate roles to play in the development of policies and in program delivery systems.

3. What role or roles might be assumed by public education in such development? The simplest answer is that public education is implicated in the development of programs for young children, and probably should assume leadership. It requires management and leadership skills sufficient to provide for development of policies and programs which, in order to schieve service integration, cut through traditional boundaries among the human services. In short, the most appropriate policy option is the most difficult.

Alternative Education in the State of Wisconsin

The paper recommends an increased role for the Department; this role is spelled out in terms of administrative guidelines.

Inservice Education

Professionals in teacher education agree that more or less continuous inservice education for practitioners at all levels and in all types of public school professional positions is necessary to adequately serve the needs of the pupil clientele.

Career Education

The extent to which local and state educational agencies can move toward change as operationalized in career education is yet to be effectively measured.

Federal Aid to Education

Ours is a federal system of government where nearly every function is shared by almost every level of government. In education, for example, financing and control have become shared responsibilities of local, state, and federal governments. The delicate nature of this shared responsibility for education is examined in this paper in which federal funds for education are viewed as an aid to the states and local communities.

Federal influence on state educational policy:

Federal aid to education has probably stimulated more controversy than has any other domestic aid program. For more than a century, debates over federal aid have pinched the most sensitive nerves of the American people--the nerves of religion, race, and states' rights. Generally, those debates center on questions of educational finance.

It is not necessary to discuss all of these issues in this paper. The central concern here is the extent to which federal dollars have influenced state educational policy. Implicit in this question is the assumption that the states have primacy in matters pertaining to public education. Overt efforts to establish a national school system or directly control even a small portion of public education from Washington are uniformly resisted by most educators and by a substantial number of politicians and citizens.

The first and most forthright response to the general question about federal influence on state education policy is to accept the fact that it exists, and it will continue to exist regardless of the distribution scheme

which is written into the law. The power to increase, diminish, or withhold funds from a public agency is potentially effective. While such power may be denied to administrators in USOE, the United States Office of Education, who will exercise such constraints on Congress? Moreover, on sober reflection, who would suggest that Congress should have no voice in determining how federal tax dollars for education are expended, or that such funds be used effectively? The very notion that the federal government should share its revenue with state and local governments on a "no strings attached" basis appears to strike hard at a basic venerable Puritan ethic which decrees that the pleasure of expenditure should never be divorced from the pain of taxation.

An example of how the federal government can use its funding power to force educational institutions to comply with its wishes can be found in federal laws and executive orders concerning race and sex discrimination. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, is an example. This federal law prohibits educational institutions, which receive federal money, from discrimination in employment in all institutions with federal contracts or grants of over $10,000. Pre-award reviews are mandatory for contracts over $1,000,000.

A more recent example of federal control exercised through appropriations is found in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act which was signed into law by President Ford as part of the 1974 amendments to ESEA. This legislation denies federal funds to any school or college that fails to allow parents to inspect, challenge, and refuse public use of their children's school record. In this act, as well as those disucssed above, federal influence extends to private schools--a greater reach than is normally available to state legislatures. Many more federal laws and regulations of this type could be cited. So, it

seems the only way for a state to retain complete autonomy respecting public education is to reject all federal funds. No state to this date has exercised this option.

Now that the existence of federal influence has been set forth in its basic form, an analysis of the control features which Congress has written into federal laws promises to shed more light on the complex question before us. Also, a realistic view of the political limitations of USOE to enforce federal regulations will provide some comfort to those who fear the "feds".

This paper is replete with reference to Congressional responses to perceived national needs. Generally, such responses find their way into federal statutes which allocate money for rather specific education programs. Categorical grants-in-aid, rather than general aid to education, have dominated the federal education scene for the past fifty years.

The federal influence inherent in categorical grants is apparent. Congress has said that the money must be spent to accomplish it goals--not necessarily those of the receiving state or operating local education agency (LEA). States may be given a greater or lesser degree of latitude in the determination of plans and programs, but generally the central thrust must be in the direction pointed by Congress. Titles II and III of ESEA and the Vocational Education Act are good examples. State plans must be submitted before grants are made. While there is no record of USOE ever rejecting one of these plans, a nominal amount of influence exists. USOE administrators do issue guidelines and provide technical assistance for the writing of state plans. Also some features of state plans may be negotiated between USOE and state departments of public instruction (DPIs). According to Berke and Kirst (1972, p. 65), who studied the process in six states, this negotiation is

generally a matter of fellow educators at different governmental levels agreeing on how the state can prusue its goals within federal guidelines.

Title I ESEA is the largest federal aid program and is targeted for disadvantaged youth. Significantly, no state plan is required to order for a state to receive its allocation of Title I funds. The money is instead distributed to LEAs according to a formula set by Congress. The DPIs provide the conduit for the distribution of Title I funds to LEAs, and they are given an allocation of funds to administer the program and to make educational and financial audits to LEAs.

In practice, however, categorical aids have even less influence on LEA spending than might be presumed. School districts, especially large city systems, have multiple sources of revenue, including bonds, property taxes, several categories of state aid, and numerous categories of federal aid. Some school districts are known to have a hundred or more separate sources of incomes and a district which can identify fewer than fifteen is rare. (Milwaukee, for example, had 54 federally funded programs in 1973.) As the total number of revenue sources proliferates, the restrictions imposed by any particular source becomes less and less enforceable. This multi-pocketed budgeting gives LEA administrators considerable latitude in the use of categorical funds. For example, if a grant is restricted to an area in which the LEA thinks it is doing an adequate job, it will work out a budgeting procedure where the federal dollars are "symbolically allocated", thereby releasing local funds for use in other areas. This multi-pocketed budgeting allows the conversion of categorical aids into general grants for education and thus defeats much of the Congressional purpose. This same phenomenon holds true for DPIs. With several sources of funds flowing into the Wisconsin DPI, who is to say precisely which funds are actually used to saitsfy a given state or federal objective?

In addition to the weakness of categorical aids as a means of achieving a congressional purpose, they suffer from a more fundamental malaise. There is no consistent federal policy or purpose served by the many federal programs. As Berke and Kirst have observed, "Each federal category is some Congressman's footnote in history and some OE bureaucrat's base of expertise. Fragmentation is extremely difficult to overcome." (1972, p 334). A good example of the severe problems inherent in this fragmented approach can be found within the various titles of ESEA. Title I is clearly earmarked for the equalization of educational opportunities for children from low-income families. However, Berke and Kirst (1972, p. 379) have noted that other titles of ESEA tend to favor children of the more prosperous parents. It seems that off-setting national programs cannot be avoided until a consistent policy is established. USOE administrators might respond to this criticism of earmarked funds by pointing out that there is nothing in ESEA or federal guidelines which would prohibit a state from developing a more uniform policy regarding the use of federal money to achieve a state purpose. For instance, Wisconsin could use virtually all of its ESEA funds, and a considerable amount of vocational education money, to improve education for the economically disadvantaged. (Due to the rather stringent control of Title I funds, however, education for the economically disadvantaged is the only single state purpose which could be achieved through the use of federal funds in Wisconsin.)

Research by Berke and Kirst suggests that state plans for each of the titles of ESEA vary tremendously. They concluded: "If federal influence were widespread and highly effective, state and local responses would tend to be uniform. As we have seen, this is not congruent with our findings" (1972, p. 378).

Finally, federal programs have a tendency to suffer from a "hardening of the categories". Administrators in the Wisconsin DPI concede that such is

the case in that state. This tendency to protect and maintain a power base makes planning most difficult and explains in part why there is no single policy regarding the use of federal funds in Wisconsin. There are goals and objectives for each program, but most needed of all is a composite statement regarding the use of federal funds.

Given the federal interest in education, one might wonder why USOE seems virtually powerless when it comes to enforcing federal guidelines or regulations. Jerome Murphy explains as follows:

> USOE's behavior has in part been adapted to take advantage of its strategically weak bargaining position. It is virtually impossible for USOE to cut off funds which the states view as their rightful entitlement under law. The states know this and so does USOE; thus, orders or demands by USOE are bound to be ineffective since they cannot be backed up by action. Furthermore, demands might alienate the states and result in a loss in communication. Since USOE's influence comes mostly from the power of persuasion, and since it is presently almost totally reliant on the states for information about local programs, it is absolutely essential that USOE maintain cordial relations with the states. Under these bargaining conditions, the states are in a position to exact a price for their good will. . . USOE's problem, then, is not simply the lack of good will or lack of staff, but lack of political muscle. (Murphy, 1971, p. 53).

Berke and Kirst (1972, p. 380) add that USOE is in an inferior political position because DPIs existed first. Consequently, they conclude, it has been impossible for USOE to create a state agency ally as has been the case in newer areas of state endeavor such as welfare and urban renewals that were initiated by federal grants.

Federal Funding of DPI

Of special interest here is the extent to which federal funds are used to support the oepration of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. This is so because of the strategic position of the DPI in setting educational policy in the state. Federal dollars spent at this level have the potential for more impact on education than would be true, if the same funds were

allocated to a single LEA in the state. The federal government has in fact spent between 2.6 and 4.5 million dollars per year for the operation of the Wisconsin DPI in the years 1969-73. This represents between 35 and 40 percent of the DPI budget.

A substantial number of permanent DPI positions are supported by federal funds. The Division for Instructional Services, the Division for Handicapped Children, and the Division for Library Services have been the principal recipients of these funds. These three division account for all but about twenty-two of 144 federally funded positions. Funds for the positions come from eighteen categorical programs supported by the federal government. These programs and Title V, Section 503, support roughtly 30 percent of the permanent staff of the Wisconsin DPI.

Title V, Section 503 Funds for Wisconsin DPI

A discussion of federal impact on education in Wisconsin would be incomplete without a more detailed examination of Title V allocations. This is the case because Section 503 funds have few strings attached, the purpose being: "To stimulate and assist states in strengthening the leadership resources of their state educational agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet the educational needs of states". (Section 501(a) of P.L. 89-10, April 11, 1965.)

Accordingly, Title V, Section 503 is important because it represents the nearest approximation to general assistance which can be found in the education acts. While the statute does include a list of suggested activities eligible for funding, in practice DPIs have been able to obtain support for any activity consistent with the broad purpose of the law--to "strengthen" DPIs. The significance of this statement is found in the fact that no DPI Title V application from any state has ever been rejected by USOE.

Approximately thirty-four permanent positions in the Wisconsin DPI were funded during fiscal year 1973 by Title V, Section 503 funds. Two-thirds of the positions were in the Division for Management and Planning Services. This use of Section 503 funds is highly consistent with the purpose of Title V as described in the statute. Moreover, it is clear that the Wisconsin DPI would suffer a substantial loss if Section 503 funds were eliminated. The Division for Management and Planning Services would be especially affected.

Access to a rather substantial block of general aid poses both opportunities and dilemmas for DPIs. In many instances the units within DPIs with the greatest manpower needs receive the bulk of the funds. This practice was criticized severely by Murphy. The major conclusion of his study of Title V program is found in the title of the report, Grease The Squeaky Wheel. (Murphy, 1973, p 6). Other researchers have not agreed with Murphy. Shanks, of the Wisconsin DPI, concluded that a withdrawal of Title V funds would severely cripple DPIs. (Shanks, 1973). The differences in these views probably result from dissimilar interpretations of "strengthening" DPIs. Apparently Murphy would have Section 503 funds utilized for more creative and imaginative DPI activities while Shanks feels that an improvement in the quality of the rather standard functions of DPIs is the best way to maintain strength in DPIs.

Thus there are disagreements about how best to utilize Section 503 funds. Curiously, in a way, the disagreement is perpetrated in part by the categorical progams which Congress has encouraged. DPI support funds from these programs have contributed to an imbalance in staffing which has been corrected to some extent by the use of Section 503 funds. Most of the 34 permanent positions now supported by Section 503 funds are in the Division of Management and Planning Services which provides research, planning, and data processing

services for many of the Divisions in the Wisconsin DPI which receive support funds for categorical programs.

Again, it is clear that federal funds are having a significant impact on DPIs. The quality and number of services provided by DPIs would be diminished greatly if federal funds were withdrawn. Less clear, however, is the among of federal impact which is attached to a fixed percent of federal support. Small amounts of strategically placed funds may have a rather large impact. Conversely, a huge amount of money may wield less influence if the funds are used in a marginal unit of the DPI. Therefore, a tipping point, where the balance of control shifts from the state to the federal government, is impossible to establish.

Future Directions of Federal Aid

Accurate predictions about future directions of federal aid are difficult because of inflation, budget deficits, unemployment, and a host of other problems which are occupying most of the attention of Congress. In fact, maintaining existing programs at present levels of fudning will require Herculean efforts. However, as noted earlier, federal programs for education seem to be born in times of national crises. Also, changes in educational policies are not normally initiated within the educational system. External pressures--Supreme Court decisions, the baby boom (more recently birth control), Sputnik, the war on poverty, community control, youth employment, the movement of women into the labor force--have resulted in more basic changes in education than have the pedagogical studies of professional educators. This practice will continue and possibly accelerate in the future. Therefore, educational policies based merely on projections or refinements of current programs are totally inadequate to meet the challenges which lie ahead. An attempt to identify future problems and a statement of assumptions about these problems seems to be a more productive way to proceed with educational forecasting.

Possible future trends have been identified by the Stanford Research Institute (1973) and similar agencies which scan the horizons for clues about the future. Examples of trends which seem likely to emerge and have profound implications for federal policy in education are:

1. Major economic challenges lie ahead, perhaps leading to a restructuring of economic institutions with resulting educational implications.

2. The decline in the number of the mature and older cities of the nation will continue.

3. The declining growth of overall federal expenditures and the attempt to bring the federal budget under control will create new priority debates ovrer national goals and domestic programs.

The risks inherent in forecasting future social and economic trends are enormous. To take such forecasts one step further and predict the educational consequences is downright hazardous. Even so, some general directions, rather than precise events, may suffice. The principal task here is to make some observations about the probable future role of the federal government in education. They are as follows:

1. <u>The federal government will expand the federal-city relationship in education which has been field-tested during the past decade.</u> Four conditions and trends seem to converge in support of this forecast. First, many people in Washington and around the nation are less than enthusiastic about the capacity of DPIs to respond to change. Secondly, correctly or otherwise, DPIs have an image which is, at best unenlightened with respect to central city education. The third trend bearing on this federal-city courtship and possible marriage is the continuing decline of the mature and older central cities. The concentration of the poor in central cities imposes a heavy burden upon what is becoming a group of bankrupt school districts. As political control of the large cities shifts to Blacks and other minority groups, their mayors and school superintendents

can be expected to march on Washington rather than on their state capitols for social justice. Finally, there is a growing opinion that the states simply cannot cope with the problems in the big cities. This belief is based on the knowledge that the problems have been created at least in part by the movement of poor people from the rural sections of some states to the urban centers in other states. Also, metropolitan areas often encompass parts of two states or more.

2. Congress will depend on agencies other than USOE to manage federal education programs. This prediction is based on the belief that formal education will become a less specialized function--one not limited to schools but shared with other institutions of society. Increasingly, educational reformers are looking to society to aid them in the attainment of educational objectives. Research results are supporting this trend as the evidence suggests a correlation between non-school factors and success in school regardless of the program of formal instruction.

3. The categorical aid approach to federal funding through USOE will not be expanded. This prediction may appear to be contradictory to earlier statements about the durable character of categorical aids and the observation that such aids were doubled with the passing of ESEA less than ten years ago. This forecast about categorical aids holds for a number of reasons. First, this prediction says nothing about the continuation of existing programs. Indeed, most of them will probably continue for many years. However, the likelihood of substantial new categorical programs seems remote because the trend is simply not in this direction. Proposals for grants consolidation and educational finance reform are more in tune with the times. As noted earlier, categorical grants tend to assume qualities closely akin to general aid because LEAs have multiple revenue sources. Also, virtually everyone condemns the concept of earmarked funds for education.

4. Grant consolidation and block grants will become increasingly popular with educators and politicians. Dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of government in America has been growing for more than a decade and is now at an all-time high. Although many reasons are given for the loss of public confidence in government, there is some agreement on the remedy--decentralization.

5. Federal funds to encourage school finance reform are a distinct possibility. (Educ. Commission of the States, 1974). While it would be erroneous to say that a national policy respecting public education has emerged in all of the categorical programs, the most recurring theme is "equal opportunity". Study groups and commissions on school finance, including the President's Commission on School Finance, have urged the federal government to provide funds to encourage school finance reform. One might point out that since Congress has been unable to reform the federal income tax structure, it would be unlikely to enter the arena of state taxes to try to accomplish that which the states cannot achieve in their own legislative halls.

Alternatives Available to DPI

The foregoing statements about likely changes in the federal role in education have enormous implications for DPI. The interests of all concerned will be served best if these implications are identified and alternative strategies considered. Such is the purpose of the final section of this paper. Before proceeding, however, it seems necessary to describe what appears to be the present posture of the DPI with respect to federal funding of education.

DPI personnel seem to be fully committed to the administration of federal programs according to statutues and USOE guidelines. The relationship between DPI programs directors and USOE administrators is inuformly harmonious. Technical assistance is often sought and received from USOE personnel and independence from other program control and influence is apparent.

A second observation about the policy of the DPI toward federal funding is that administrators are under pressure to get as much money as possible. While this is not necessarily the official policy of the DPI, it permeates the entire Department. Survival in a highly bureaucratic structure demands no less of program hears. Also, the citizens of Wisconsin, like their counterparts in all other states, want their federal tax dollars returned to the state. Therefore, complaints about federal controls are generally kept within the DPI and soon become lost in the press for more federal funds. Indeed, the most pervasive criticism of federal programs is that the money allocation is insufficient--not the existence of unreasonable federal control. This unwritten policy concerning the need for more federal funds is understandable because, as noted earlier, the level of federal aid received has not been favorable to Wisconsin.

The third, and final generalization about DPI policy respecting federal programs is the absence of a programmatic thrust within DPI. Each categorical program has goals and objectives, but there is no evidence of a single state plan. While federal statutes and guidelines do place restrictions on the use of funds, it would be possible to identify one or a few programmatic thrusts to be pursued to the extent that discretion permits. All of the federal programs do allow for a considerable amount of state determination respecting the use of funds.

These observations about DPI policy and the predictions about DPI policy and the predictions about the changing role of the federal government in education provide the background for the following list of DPI alternatives.

1. Develop a DPI philosophy regarding federal funding. The wisest management strategy is to use such funds to satisfy DPI goals as far as possible. Given the plethora of categorical programs now funded by the federal government,

it is possible for the DPI to shape the use of these funds to resemble general aid. The necessary but missing ingredient is a single programmatic thrust and policies to implement it.

2. Counteract the federal-city relationship by making a greater effort to respond to the needs of the large metropolitan areas in the state.

3. Expand the concept of education. Formal education must be seen more as a function of society as a whole than of school as separate and distinct institutions.

4. Change the present concept of management of federal programs. In other words, the focus will be on outputs rather than inputs. The states will be held accountable for results.

The DPI implications from this precistion are rather impressive. The major emphasis in the future will be on program evaluation. In this instance the DPI may be forced to utilize a similar management strategy with LEAs to complete the accountability chain.

A Carrot or a Stick?

A central theme permeating this paper is that Congress has used its power to fund education as a carrot to persuade states and LEAs to comply with its wishes respecting an emphasis in education. In some instances the emphasis has been narrowly defined and in others the funds have been used for a variety of programs. Also, the Congress has provided a substantial "bonus" in some acts and but a token one in others. In virtually all instances, however, the technique has been to offer a financial incentive with the implied threat of withdrawal if states or LEAs fail to comply with the federal statutes and the attendant USOE guidelines.

Congress has adopted a posture of persuading rather than prodding because

of its weak legal position regarding the control of public education. As noted earlier, the U.S. Constitution has established education as a function of the several states. Congress can tax and spend for education under the General Welfare clause but it has no legal obligation to do so, and there is no constitutional authority for Congress to directly control or manage the schools. Accordingly, Congress has adopted the "carrot" approach because it is the only tool available. It follows that there is no stick in the federal-state relationship in education except to the extent that the potential denial of funds is so perceived. Those who regard such an eventuality as an undisguised stick seek to regain control of federal tax dollars as entitlement of the states rather than an "aid" to a state function. While federal education acts often include a measure of this concept, as represented by formula distributions and no pre-grant approval by USOE, there is no constitutional reuqirement that Congress provide aid for all schools or any schools. Therefore, those who would establish the federal Congress as the tax collector for public schools must depend on the political process or change the Constitution.

The foregoing conclusions about the federal-state relationship are equally appropriate for the interaction between the Wisconsin DPI and the federal government. The DPI has accepted large sums of federal money for its own support. With the single exception of Title V, this money has been earmarked for specific programs. However, given the discretion which is generally included in the federal acts, and the flexibility afforded by multiple sources of income, the funds have been used to strengthen the DPI without relinquishing control to Washington. Therefore, if federal funds were withdrawn from the DPI, there would be a substantial diminution in the range and quality of services, without an appreciable increase in the degree of state control.

WYOMING

Robert G. Shrader
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Following, not necessarily in priority order, is a listing of what I consider to be critical problems and issues which we are facing in education in the State of Wyoming.

1. Population Impact. Development of coal and energy-related resources in Wyoming's Powder River Basin has caused and will continue to cause considerable increase in the regional population between now and 1980. If these districts do not provide accommodations fsor increased enrollments, we can anticipate the following results:

1. Classroom sizes will quickly reach capacity and necessitate high pupil-teacher ratios. (Wyoming presently ranks second in the nation with a pupil-teacher ratio of 18.5 to 1.)

2. Overcrowded conditions and lack of classroom space in existing facilities may necessitate the use of temporary structures such as mobile trailers and modular units.

3. Lack of adequate classrooms and gymnasium facilities may necessitate the operation of some schools on a double-session basis.

4. Inter-county busing of students between school districts may be necessary.

5. The overall quality of education may be seriously and adversely affected.

The following steps would help meet both temporary and permanent impact needs:

1. Continue to provide adequate and additional state assistance to the School Foundation Program for the annual maintenance of school programs.

2. Provide a School Construction Fund with adequate resources to meet the need for public school facilities.

ability to teach. Professional preparation should continue thorughout the career of the practitioner if education is to be relevant to today's rapidly changing society.

7. Private School Licensing. Experience over the past several years seems to indicate several areas of concern relating to the private school licensing program. One is the lack of intercommunication. Another is the need for some evaluation of the performance of these schools in terms of their objectives.

Another concern is the definition of a private school.

Perhaps the greatest concern is the clarification of the objectives for each school's program and some determination of whether these objectives are being met.

8. Indian Education. Indian education problems are compounded by multiple sources of funding and various types of organizational structure. The sources of funding include local, state, and private funding as well as several categorical and general federal fund support.

It appears that no one takes the responsibility for assuring educational quality and relevance. A major topic of concern is the control of educational programs and facilities by Indians, whether reservation residents or not. Many tribes are making a great effort to relate their culture and customs to the educational process so that they can develop a contemporary understanding and appreciation of both the Indian world and the non-Indian world.

9. Gifted and Talented. To date there are no operational programs, either formal or informal, which cater to the special needs of gifted students, nor is there any statutory requirement requiring them. The real key to the education of gifted and talented students lies with the education of teachers in the techniques of the identification of the gifted student, and in the methods of dealing with the gifted student.

3. Assess the value of constructions annually and enter on the tax rolls. The delay in assessment until a construction is completed causes considerable hardships in meeting financial demands.

4. Make funds available to school districts for planning capital construction porjects.

5. Plan for an equalized capital construction program applicable to all Wyoming school districts.

2. Data Collection. The collection of data is necessary to identify priorities, to contribute to the solution of major issues, to plan and manage programs, to allocate resources, to assess program effectiveness, to enact legislation, to audit expenditures and to exercise stewardship over public funds.

3. Inequities in Educational Funding. Disparities in per pupil expenditures, correlations between the level of expenditure and the quality of education, unequal distribution of property wealth, fiscal neutrality, and "thorough and efficient" system of education.

4. Institutional Education. In my opinion the quality of education at the state institutions is not as good as it might be because (1) there is little if any coordination between the education programs of the institutions and (2) there is extremely limited input from SDE staff on curriculum, diagnosis, planning, etc. The institutions cannot effectively do much long-range planning. Consequently, continuity in programming suffers considerably.

5. Late Funding for Federal Programs. The problem of late funding has been with state and local education agencies for some time.

6. Certification. The present certification system is being severely criticized because its emphasis is based upon the courses a teacher education student has taken, with no proof that the courses are related in any way to an applicant's

Dr. Byron Hansford
Executive Secretary, CSSO

I believe the problems of American education today, are not surprisingly, a part of the problems of society and in some cases a reflection of them.

I believe that since the end of WW II both society and the individuals who make up society have consciously or unconsciously abandoned the traditional values of the past without adopting a satisfactory set of values to replace them. All of this was accompanied by a series of court cases which rejected the old authority in favor of individual freedom. This change is dramatically illustrated by the changed expectations of women.

I believe that the anonymity for the individual which has accompanied the move to urbanization and the breakdown of the neighborhood, urban, suburban, and rural has removed many of the restraints against antisocial behavior and many of the incentives toward desirable behavior and accomplishment. A student may be known by name but feels that he is not known as an individual or as part of a family unit.

In the past perhaps the greatest positive force for good in the life of an individual was the family. The family was the place where values were learned, where life was given a sense of purpose, and where the love and attention given the individual made him a secure person.

As society has become more complex, more governmental services have been required and as the influence of the family, the neighborhood, the church, and other social institutions have diminished, great voids have been created which need to be filled. In some cases the schools have attempted to fill these voids. There must be a clarification of the role of the school so that the total school staff can work twoard the same goals and objectives and so that adequate resources can be provided to accomplish the purposes. As changing

roles emerge for the schools, there must also be changing patterns of support. Concurrent with these extremely complex problems there are evolving problems concerning the relationship and role of teachers, administrators, boards, and citizens.

I will make some statements which are indicative of the problems. These statements are:

1. Local school districts cannot adequately meet the current and emerging needs of education but they are concerned about losing control as the state and federal governments get involved.

2. Education is a state responsibility but most of the operational control of the schools have been entrusted to local districts. In an effort to increase quality and assure equality, the states are progessively providing more financing which is accompanied by more control.

3. The federal role in education has not been clearly defined.

4. Teachers maintain they cannot be accountable without having control of most of education.

5. Administrators are caught between the teacher organizations and the wishes of boards and parents.

6. Boards of education are faced with ever-increasing demands from educators, as well as a growing disenchantment on the part of the parents who feel that they are not adequately represented.

7. Concerned citizens, who have witnessed much growth in education and increased complexity, feel that they are losing control over the education of their children but are not sure how to intervene successfully.

I will now attempt to identify some of the difficulties with federal education programs and their administration.

1. Federal programs are usually too narrowly categorical to meet state and local needs.

2. The administrative detail and reporting involved far exceeds the relative monetary value of the programs.

3. The administrators of federal programs often make demands which go far beyond the letter of the law.

4. Federal dollars should be made available to help state and local educators to meet the educational needs which they have identified.

5. State and local educators should be involved in the planning and development of federal legislation rather than just being allowed to react after the legislation is practically in the final form.

6. State and local educators frequently do not know in advance the extent of their federal entitlement or when they will get the funds.

7. Frequently federal auditors seem to operate from a different set of guidelines from those guiding program personnel and state and local administrators.

8. Federal data collection efforts should be coordinated with state and local efforts to assure maximum benefit from the date with minimum effort on the part of those who must furnish the data.

Finally, if the schools are going to successfully fulfill their role in society the following problems will have to be resolved:

1. Schools are affected by the general lack of trust in government.

2. Inflation is making it most difficult for schools to do a good job on existing resources.

3. As a result of inflation, teachers are demanding more and more money thereby further widening the credibility gap.

4. Declining enrollments limit funds and programs and the ability to satisfy the desires of the community.

5. In the past the results of education were more evident and more appreciated.

6. The courts have mandated new and expanded programs as well as rejecting old financing plans without providing adequate alternative solutions.

7. Special interest groups, often motivated by concerns outside of education, are demanding control of the schools.

8. Salary schedules based on training and experience, coupled with teacher tenure are stacking people at the top of the salary schedule which has an adverse effect on the ability of the district to support an educational program and also motivation for teachers to improve.

9. Todays students vary greatly from students in the past with regard to their motivations, drives and levels of sophistication, therefore schools will have adapt to new needs and expectations.

APPENDIX A

CRITICAL ISSUES

1. FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE: Equalization, Tax Reform, Federal-State-Local, National Coalition, O.E. Leadership, O.E. Regional Offices, Educational Policies Commission, Education Commission of the States, Federal Secretary of Education, Federal Collective Bargaining, Desegregation, Clarify Federal-State Relationships, Federal Regulations, Public Demands, Professional vs. Lay Control, Influence of Chiefs and States, State Budget Restrictions, School District Reorganization, Regional Service Units, Community Involvement, Financial Reform in Face of Declining Revenues, Educational Governance--Role Definition--Court Intervention, Interagency and Interinstitutional Relationships.

2. PLANNING AND EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY: Assessment, Testing, Federal-State-Local Reporting Procedures, Funding Schedules, Nature of Change, Setting Goals and Objectives, Private School Licensing, State Audits, Evaluation of Students, Accountability.

3. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Teacher Centers, Overseas Education Personnel, Balancing Teacher Welfare with Child Well-Being Negotiations, Leadership Programs, Teacher Education, Certification.

4. SCHOOL CURRICULUM AND RESPONSIVENESS: Indian Education, Articulation of Elementary-High School-College, Rural Education, Urban Education, Student Discipline--Involvement--Dissillusionment, Law Education, Consumer Education, Alternative Education, Affective Education, Humanizing Education, Exceptional Child, Gifted, Career, Vocational, Early Childhood and Preschool, Parent, Post-High School, Bilingual, International, Computer, Art Aerospace Education.

5. SOCIETAL ISSUES: Desegregation, National Priorities, Condition of the Economy, Isolation--Racial and Socio-Economic, Energy, Food, Problems of Population Shifts, Growth and Decline.